239.05 Class [redacted] Book [redacted]
1887
General Theological Seminary Library
Ninth Ave. and 20th St., New York.
Besides the main topic this book also treats of

Subject No.	*On page*	*Subject No.*	*On page*

THE BISHOP PADDOCK LECTURES FOR 1887.

CHRISTENDOM:

ECCLESIASTICAL AND POLITICAL, FROM CONSTANTINE TO THE REFORMATION

By JOHN HODSON EGAR, S.T.D.,

Rector of Zion Church, Rome, N. Y.

Sometime Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Nashotah Theological Seminary.

GEN. THEO. SEMINARY
LIBRARY
NEW YORK.

NEW YORK:
JAMES POTT & CO., Publishers.
1887.

239.05
1887

17034

Copyright, 1887,
By JAMES POTT & CO.

GENEVA THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
LIBRARY
NEW YORK

Press of A. G. Sherwood & Co.,
47 Lafayette Place, New York.

CONTENTS.

		PAGE.
I.	Byzantinism,	3
II.	The Roman Reaction,	61
III.	The Conversion of the Franks,	121
IV.	The New Imperialism,	175
V.	Papalism,	227
VI.	Nationalism,	291

PREFACE.

For some years it was my duty and privilege, as Professor of Ecclesiastical History at Nashotah, to direct the studies in that department of the young men preparing there for the Ministry of the Church. I then found it both necessary and profitable to trace for them, as well as I was able, the connection between the Ecclesiastical and the Political History of the different periods that came under review. The interest manifested in these explanations suggested to me that a course of lectures on this subject might be useful to such of the intelligent laity as are desirous to inform themselves about the past history of the Church ; and the design of writing such a course, when I should have opportunity to set about it, gradually grew in my mind.

Other duties, however, prevented any serious attempt to realize this intention, until last year I received the honor of being appointed the Bishop Paddock Lecturer for 1887. On being notified of the appointment, it seemed to me that I could best fulfil it by giving my lectures this direction; and, having consulted the Dean of the General Theological Seminary, and received his opinion that such a course would be within the intention of the Foundation, this book is the result. I had not the presumption to think (and I told my hearers so, in the few words with which I prefaced the first lecture,) that I could add anything to the instruction which the students of the General Theological Seminary

receive from their learned professors ; but I hoped that what I wrote might be useful to some who have not their advantages, if it should prove readable when in print.

It will be seen from this explanation that the opinions expressed in these lectures have not been hastily conceived, or set forth without consideration.

It has not been thought necessary to give references for facts which are the common matter of Ecclesiastical or Secular History. The few that are given upon particular points are to such books as I was able to consult while writing in my own study.

ROME, N. Y.,
Feast of the Transfiguration,
1887.

THE BISHOP PADDOCK LECTURES.

In the summer of the year 1880, GEORGE A. JARVIS, of Brooklyn, N. Y., moved by his sense of the great good which might thereby accrue to the cause of CHRIST and to the Church, of which he was an ever grateful member, gave to the General Theological Seminary of the Protestant Episcopal Church certain securities exceeding in value eleven thousand dollars for the foundation and maintenance of a Lectureship in said Seminary. Out of love to a former pastor and enduring friend, the Rt. Rev. Benjamin Henry Paddock, D.D., Bishop of Massachusetts, he named his Foundation "THE BISHOP PADDOCK LECTURESHIP."

The deed of trust declares that :

"The *subjects* of the Lectures shall be such as appertain to the defence of the religion of JESUS CHRIST, as revealed in the *Holy Bible* and illustrated in the *Book of Common Prayer* against the varying errors of the day, whether materialistic, rationalistic, or professedly religious, and also to its defence and confirmation in respect of such central truths as the *Trinity*, the *Atonement*, *Justification*, and the *Inspiration of the Word of God*, and of such central facts as the *Church's Divine Order and Sacraments*, her historical *Reformation* and her rights and powers as a pure and National Church. And other subjects may be chosen if unanimously approved by the Board of Appointment as beingboth timely and also within the true intent of this Lectureship."

Under the appointment of the Board created by the Trust, viz., the Dean of the General Theological Seminary, and the Bishops respectively of Massachusetts, Connecticut and Long Island, the Rev. John H. Egar, D.D., Rector of Zion Church, Rome, N. Y., delivered the Lectures for the year 1887, contained in this volume. They may be considered as bearing upon the Church's "historical Reformation, and her rights and powers as a pure and National Church."

I.

BYZANTINISM.

I.

BYZANTINISM.

At the beginning of the fourth century, the Church of Christ had extended itself throughout the length and breadth of the Roman Empire, and had carried its missions into countries beyond its bounds. It had passed safely through all but the last of the great persecutions by which the heathen emperors had sought to put it down. It had successfully resisted the attempts of the Oriental *gnosis*, and of Greek philosophy to adulterate the faith in Christ; and it had infused with that faith, into the hearts of multitudes of every class and condition the love of God and of the brethren, and the hope of eternal life. It had fixed the brand of the Divine displeasure upon sin and wickedness, and established the tradition and habit of good morals and personal purity through the example of several generations of its members; and it was constantly widening its influence by the conversion of those outside and their incorporation into its body. It was an extensive and powerful organization, whose strength lay in the consciousness of a Divine mission and Divine help, in the possession of a certain faith and a fixed rule of life, in

the zeal and devotion of its clergy, and the loyal and free adhesion of its laity. The arts it used to extend its influence were such as convinced the mind and appealed to the heart; and the methods it employed to keep it were such as trained its members to "hold the faith in unity of spirit, in the bond of peace and in righteousness of life."

At the time I am speaking of, the primitive polity had developed and fixed itself so that there is no difficulty in tracing the means by which every member of the vast company of the faithful was in active and actual communion with every other member. I do not need, for the purpose of these lectures to recapitulate, however briefly, the facts which are accessible, in the numerous histories of the primitive Church, to every one who cares to read. In ancient liturgies still extant we have sufficient evidence to show what was the common worship; and in the ancient canons, the decrees of Councils, and the writings of the fathers, we are certified of the faith, the discipline and the government of the Church. The baptized member, in whatever place, if sound in faith and correct in life, was in communion with the ascended Head of the Church through frequent Eucharists, and with his brethren everywhere throughout the world, through the Bishops of the Apostolic Succession. In every local church there were the three orders of bishop, presbyters and deacons, and under them a body of minor officers, through whom the clerical influence reached all ranks and classes; there was

a chosen band of devoted and perhaps ascetic individuals; and there was a laity who followed the Gospel of Christ in the midst of a world demonstrably and visibly lying in wickedness. With some variety in detail, the bishops and churches of each province or nation were united, for the government of the provincial or national Church, under one of their number as metropolitan or chief, with whom they met in council from time to time, as the canons prescribed, or the exigencies of the Church demanded. The provincial churches were in communion with one another by frequent messengers bearing official letters, as well as by the presence of communicants or clergy properly certified, whose affairs led them from one place to another. As individual schismatics or heretics, or immoral persons were cut off from the unity of the Church by exclusion from the sacraments until their penance proved their repentance, so communities which were infected with schism or heresy were refused the customary letters, and were held to be out of the communion of the Catholic body as long as these were denied. And thus, in the absence of General Councils, or of the other expedients of later days, the ante-Nicene polity was amply sufficient to secure the external unity of the Church at large, as well as the edification of the individual member.

So powerful a body as the Catholic Church of the fourth century, animated with such an inward spirit, and held together in such a comprehensive and effective organization, disciplined by adversity, and welded to-

gether by persecution, so strong in temper, and so vast in extent, could not fail, sooner or later, to impress the head of the Roman Empire, either with a claim upon his allegiance, or with a desire for its alliance. But when the time came, whether the Emperor gave his sincere adhesion to Christianity, or only courted its political alliance, it was not in the nature of things that the condition of the Church should be what it had been, or that some modification of its organization and methods should not ensue. The conversion of Constantine, whether it were genuine or superficial, was an event of no common magnitude, and contains within itself the germ of much of the Church's history for the past fifteen hundred years. It was the beginning of the union of Church and State—it could not be otherwise—and the action and reaction of these great powers one upon the other, constitutes the external history of the Church from that time until the present.

I propose in this course of lectures to review the relation of Church and State from Constantine to the Reformation, and to point out some of the ways in which the history of the Church has been modified by that relation. The connexion between the political and the religious history of Christendom has not been brought out as it should be for the information of the general reader. The secular historians have viewed it from the secular stand-point, and have praised or censured the Church in different ages, according as it has seemed subservient or otherwise to the necessities of national

politics ; while the ecclesiastical historians have either neglected the relation, or as Romanist, or Anglican, or Lutheran, or Calvinistic, have presented views of it, colored by their own bias, and such as we of the American Church, studying it for ourselves, should not take.

Did Constantine give the Church his adhesion, or did he only court its alliance ? That is the first question. My answer is, he did both—the first partially and imperfectly, the latter urgently, but both really. It is the fault of sceptical as well as of shallow historians, that if they think they see men influenced by lower motives, they cannot give them credit for higher motives also, or appreciate the fact that the actors in the scenes they describe may have a faith or a purpose which they do not possess, and therefore cannot conceive. You all know in what darkening colors Gibbon draws the portrait of Constantine, and how his character has suffered or been glorified according to the controversial bias of the historian. To my mind the position of Constantine in history is plain. He was a great man, a great soldier, a great organizer, a great ruler, having a definite policy to which he endeavored to bend the Church because he believed in it. He was prudent, temperate and continent by habit and self-restraint. He won his battles by good generalship as well as by the favor of Providence. He had the eye of a great military engineer, as he showed in the choice of the site for his city of Constantinople. He organized the Eastern

Empire so that it preserved the form he gave it for a thousand years after his time. And withal he was naturally religious. He was a firm believer in Divine Providence ; and he recognized in Christianity and the Church the only instrument for preserving that belief, or for infusing it into the minds of his subjects, and bringing them back to that morality of which heathenism was so utterly void.

Now whatever were the weaknesses of Constantine—and personal vanity was undoubtedly one of them—it is not within the limits of probability that he allowed himself to be swayed, in his treatment of the Church, by the counsels of those who happened to gain his ear. It is the convenient explanation of such as think his actions to be inconsistent, to attribute them to the weakness of a sovereign who could be approached through his vanity, and wrought upon by the arts of the courtier. But no one could have reached the sole occupancy of the Imperial throne as Constantine did, and have so organized the empire that it existed with the constitution he gave it, as long as it existed at all, who did not know his own mind and pursue his own policy. And just as soon as we have gained the key to that policy, we shall find it to have been consistent throughout, and that Constantine not only had it definitely fixed in his own mind, but so impressed it upon the empire that it continued to be the policy of the emperors through all the troubled and perplexed ages that followed. I do not think that Constantine's adhesion

to Christianity was more than an enlightened Deism for many years after he began to interest himself in the affairs of the Church. He accepted the truths of the Divine Unity, and of the active intervention of Providence in human affairs; he recognized that Polytheism was dead, and that Atheism was no creed for a man. He allied himself with the Church, not only to conciliate a powerful party in his contests with Maxentius and Licinius, but because as between Polytheism and the Divine Unity he was really with the Church; and also (and this was not the least powerful of the mixed motives which animated him) because he saw in the Church the means of bringing the religious sanctions of moral conduct into the minds of his subjects, of making the religious feeling a basis of loyalty to the Emperor, and so of securing the stability of the empire. But as regards the dogmas of the Catholic faith, it seems to me that he was not unbelieving, but indifferent. If we may judge from his somewhat ambiguous actions at an early period, as well as his inconsistency with regard to the Council of Nicaea, his idea was that he could combine with Christianity, as he understood it, what was really or philosophically religious in the effete paganism of the age, and so attain, if not a unity of belief among the people at large, yet such a mutual toleration and gradual convergence as might permit all parties to acknowledge that they worshipped the same deity—the same Divine Providence—whether they called him "Jehovah, Jove or Lord." Without a real acceptance of the

Catholic faith, Constantine believed in the Church, and therefore he would use the Church. He attached the Christians, and especially the bishops, to himself personally, by toleration, by justice and by favors. He granted the clergy valuable privileges and exemptions. He made companions of ecclesiastics and was inquisitive into their doctrines. He prescribed the observance of Sunday, and he not only listened to sermons but preached them. But he put off his baptism until his last illness, and then received it at the hands of an Arian. And although he convened the Ecumenical Council of Nicaea, which settled once for all the Faith against Arianism, yet after a time he attempted to set it aside. His real desire, I doubt not, was for a latitudinarian creed which should allow diverse opinions in the Church; and his chief interest was that the Church, through its teachings of morality, of order and of loyalty, should be the supporter of the empire, and that the unity of religion upon this basis should be the guarantee of the Imperial throne.

There never was invented by the mind of man such another perfect instrument of government as that established by Constantine. Inheriting the traditions of the empire from his predecessors, and profiting by his education at the court of the astute Diocletian, he had the genius to plan, and the skill to put in operation a scheme of administration which left nothing to be desired except a care for the welfare and happiness of the people. As an instrument of the supreme power it

was perfect ; and it preserved the empire for a thousand years, in the midst of commotions internal and external, against enemies abroad and discontent at home, notwithstanding the folly of rulers, the selfishness of officials, the degradation of the people, and the absence of any feeling of patriotism in any class. To one situated as Constantine was, with the history of his associates and predecessors before his eyes, his object as an organizer must be to consolidate the government, so that revolutions and rebellions should be void of the hope of success and the throne stable and secure. The Imperial authority had grown up by the assumption of all the effective powers of the Roman Republic into the hands of the man who had the command of the army. Following the example of the first Augustus, the Imperator was consul when he chose to be, prince of the senate, tribune of the people, censor, pontifex maximus, and invested with perpetual proconsular authority. But these diverse titles to power had by this time become merged in the one fact of universal rule, resting upon the loyalty of the army, and terminated when the army deposed or murdered its general, or was defeated by another general of superior ability or fortune. When Constantine became sole head of the empire and the army, he determined to put an end to this supremacy of the army, by balancing it with other establishments, the heads of which would be sufficiently jealous of each other, if not faithful to the reigning sovereign, to be unwilling to imperil themselves by combining together

for the sole benefit of one of their number. He therefore reorganized the empire. He built Constantinople for a new Rome, free from the traditions, but invested with the privileges of old Rome, and he gave the senate of Constantinople all the powers which still remained to the Roman senate. Here he fixed his residence and the seat of government. He divided the empire into four prætorian prefectures, these into thirteen dioceses, and these again into provinces, of which there were about a hundred and twenty. He separated the military authority of his subordinates from the civil authority, and so took away the power of rebellion. By dividing the military, the judicial and the financial departments of the government, he made each of them a support of the throne, instead of dangerous to it, as they were when all combined in the hands of subordinates. It is from the reforms of Constantine that modern administrations have taken the principle of government by bureaus, or departments.

It is a great mistake to infer from the history of Gibbon or Milman that the Eastern Empire was a weak and contemptible affair. It was, measured by its stability, the strongest secular power which has ever existed, and it might have continued to this day had it known how to do two things: to admit the people to that share in the government which would make it their own, and to refrain from the endeavor to force the Church into the framework of the political machinery. But it had no sympathy with the people, and no real

sense of the spiritual vocation of the Church. The theory of the empire was despotic, and according to that theory, all power over body and soul must centre in and emanate from the emperor. Around him were grouped in solid phalanx, the legislative, the financial, the judicial, the military departments, all of which received their authority from him, carried out his will, and existed by his decree. But each department was kept carefully distinct from the others, graded into ranks of subordination, conducted on a fixed system of procedure, and manned by professional experts, who gave regularity to the administration, whatever were the character of the emperor, for the time being. "The numerous individuals employed in each ministerial department of the state," says Mr. Finlay, "consisted of (*qu.* constituted?) a body of men appropriated to that special service, which they were compelled to study attentively, to which they devoted their lives, and in which they were sure to rise by talent and industry. Each department formed a separate profession, as completely distinct and as perfectly organized in its internal arrangements as the legal profession is in modern Europe. A Roman emperor would no more have thought of suddenly creating a financier or an administrator than a modern sovereign would think of making a lawyer."* This circumstance, he adds, affords an explanation of the singular duration of the Roman

* Finlay, Greeks under the Romans. p. 238.

government (in the East), and of its inherent principle of vitality.

Into such a despotic framework of government the policy of Constantine sought to force the Church. That power which held in its hands the practical instruction of the people, the guidance of their opinions, and the conduct of their lives, that too must be organized and subjected to the Imperial rule. That power Constantine found embodied in the Christian Church, and nowhere else. He must therefore enter into alliance with the Church; he must become its head, as the head of every other department of government; he must make it useful to the empire by attaching it to the throne. As Pontifex Maximus it was his office to regulate the religion of the empire; and his belief in his office, as well as his belief in the Church, led him to make the attempt, and to leave that attempt as a part of his political legacy to his successors. "You are bishops within the Church, I am bishop without," was a saying of his, the meaning of which has been thought uncertain. It merely meant, I am Pontifex Maximus of the Roman Empire.

The first measures of Constantine were measures of simple justice. In securing toleration for the Christians, in restoring their estates, in granting the clergy exemption from public offices, he was only placing the Christian religion among the permitted religions of the empire, and granting to the Church the same privileges as were enjoyed by the heathen priesthood and temples.

Nor is it to be wondered at that the gratitude of a lately persecuted and proscribed people should be lavish in its expressions of adulation, and generous in its judgment of the authority which so befriended them. And when the Emperor interested himself more particularly in the affairs of the Church, the want of experience, if nothing else, would make them blind to the dangers of interference. The Emperor had as much right to be a Christian as the meanest of his subjects, and as much right to use his influence in favor of the religion he professed. It was not until after the fierce contest with Arianism, that the jealous watchfulness of the faithful was aroused against imperial tampering with the faith, and political passion added its fierceness to the *odium theologicum* which has for so many ages been the bane of controversy.

To accomplish the end Constantine had in view, if this interpretation of his motives is correct, two measures seemed to be necessary; the one to secure a lax and flexible creed ; the other to mould the organization of the Church into a hierarchy, by means of which the whole body could be controlled from a single centre.

The rise of the Arian heresy offered the opportunity to attempt the first. The history of this attempt, and of its final defeat is an illustration of the inherent power of the Church to preserve the faith by virtue of its Catholicity, no matter what forces are opposed to it. The dogmas of the Catholic faith are facts ; they are

dogmas because they are facts ; and they are propounded to our faith to receive them as facts, upon the Divine and human testimony by which they are authenticated. The dogma of the Trinity is the truth of the Trinity, as revealed through our Lord Jesus Christ ; the dogma of the Incarnation is the fact of the Incarnation ; the dogma or mystery of Redemption is the fact of Redemption. The Church is a witness and keeper of these truths, or facts, to preserve and hand down the faith in them unimpaired from age to age. Heresy is the attempt to overthrow the belief of some or other of the facts of the faith, because it does not square with the preconceived notions, or tendencies of thought, or philosophical reasonings, or inveterate prejudices which have taken hold of the mind. It has its roots in the previous tradition or training of the individual or the community which adopts it, and it is frequently the outgrowth of the national tendency of a people. It must be evident to a thinking mind, upon a survey of the history of the four great General Councils, that unless the Church had been Catholic from the beginning, the different schools of Christian thought would have diverged from one another according to the national or sectional characteristics of the various peoples, and we should have had, instead of one universal Creed, a multitude of doctrines as diverse as the philosophies of the ancient world. Each national or sectional tendency would have modified the faith in the direction of its own one-sided bias, and there would have been, for exam-

ple, a rationalizing and humanitarian creed at Antioch, and a pantheistic and mystical creed at Alexandria. But inasmuch as every part of the Church must be in communion with every other part, in order that the Church might be Catholic or universal, the opposite tendencies providentially neutralized each other, and preserved the equilibrium of the faith. And that is why, in the order of Divine Providence, and under the governing influence of the Holy Spirit, no body less than the whole Catholic or universal Church can define the faith; because there is always in the schismatical, or isolated body, a tendency to aberration, which must be corrected through the communion of the members with one another in the unity of the Spirit and the bond of peace. The faith is a deposit; it is not an invention, not a development, not a reasoned-out system. It was given once for all, to be handed down as it was received; its mysteries are facts which once true are always true; and when once the fact is assailed by a false logic or false philosophy, the false logic or false philosophy must be overthrown by those who are not misled by it; and then, when that is done, the truth remains what it had been, and the Church continues to profess the faith once delivered to the saints.

Now the Arian heresy was one in which the peculiar tendency of the school of Antioch had thus perverted the faith. The denial of the uncreated Deity of the only-begotten Son was felt by the heathen themselves to open the way for Polytheism into the Church. The

fact of an aberration came to light through the connection of Arius, who had been a pupil of Lucian of Antioch, with the Church of Alexandria. That, however, was only the manifestation of the fact; the wide-spread sympathy which Arius met with in the East showed that the tendency was deep-seated; and the time had come when the Church Catholic must reassert the fact that our blessed Lord is very and eternal God, in a form which would not only put down the heresy, but correct the tendency which gave rise to it. Had Constantine not mingled in the controversy, there is no doubt that the previous methods of the Church, which had been found effective in all other cases, would have been sufficient in this. But in the Divine Providence, as if to stamp at the beginning, the indelible character upon the union of Church and State, and to frustrate forever the attempt to make the faith indefinite from motives of political expediency, the Emperor was led to convene the Council of Nicæa, and in that, the first Ecumenical Council, the faith was asserted in its integrity, and the term "of one substance with the Father," was added to the creed, to make Arianism impossible forever after in the Church.

There is no doubt that Constantine did not desire this result. His letter to Alexander and Arius jointly shows that he considered the question whether our blessed Lord is God to be worshipped, or a creature whom to worship is idolatry, an unimportant one, on which they might agree to differ. Indeed I think his

assembling of the Nicene Council itself had as much connection in his mind with the celebration of his Vicennalia as with the vindication of the faith of the Church. He intended it as a state pageant, a demonstration of his adoption of Christianity as the state religion; and he hoped that he could persuade the Christians to cease their disputes, and bury the question in silence. But he had seen and known too much of the temper of the Church, of its constancy under persecution, to offer direct opposition when the decision was determined on; the unanimity of the decree (all signed it but five) was too overwhelming; and he contented himself with banishing the heretical leaders for the present, and waiting for the time when he could quietly set aside the Council.* Soon after the adjournment of the Council he made a decree that no one should be admitted into the ranks of the clergy, except to fill vacancies, and that none should be ordained who were liable to the *curia*,† that is, who by their wealth were responsible for the public and municipal service—a law from which, of course, a dispensation could be obtained by imperial favor, and in which there lies the germ of the *congé d' elire* which to this day places the nomination of the English bishops in the power of the crown. After some delay he revoked the sentence of banishment against Arius and his followers, and, professing to

* Was not the cloud upon Constantine during the latter part of his life due in part to disappointment at the turn of ecclesiastical affairs?

† Fleury, B. XI., 31.

believe that they were really at one with the Church in doctrine, ordered that the arch-heretic should be received to communion, a profanation which the death of Arius prevented. He permitted the Arian party to depose Eustathius, the Bishop of Antioch, and to intrigue against St. Athanasius, whom he banished in the year before his death. These acts are significant.

The history of the Eastern Church for the half-century between the Council of Nicæa and that of Constantinople is, in reality, not so much the history of the conflict of the Church with an obstinate and widespread heresy, as it is that of the Church with the Imperial policy. The scheme of Constantine broke down at the beginning so far as the faith was concerned; and yet it continued to be the policy of the empire, and the most desperate efforts were made to insure its success. We are in the habit of calling Constantius and Valens Arians, and of accounting for their conduct by the assumption that they fell under the influence of the subtle Arian leaders. The expressions are misleading. It is not an uncommon experience in state-craft, that subtle and wily men, who think they are using a ruler for their own purposes, are in reality being used by him for his purposes. I believe that this happened to the Arian leaders at this time, and that the confusion they wrought was connived at by the emperors, not so much out of sympathy with their doctrines, or belief in their heresy, as in pursuance of a deeper policy, directed to the complete subjection of the Church to the State.

What was demanded of the Catholic bishops was not that they should give up their own personal belief in the Eternal Son, but that they should admit to the communion of the Church on equal terms, those who denied Him to be consubstantial with the Father. The Emperor Constantius was not so much an Arian as a Latitudinarian. He would have been just as averse to a definite and exclusive Arian creed for the universal creed of the Church as to the Nicene Creed, and he tolerated and encouraged the making of creed after creed, until he could find one sufficiently indefinite for his purpose. The real creed of the so-called Arian emperors was the creed of the Council of Rimini (A.D. 359); and it was their creed because on the point in dispute it meant nothing and it said nothing. It was suited to the imperial policy, not because it confessed Arianism, but because it would permit the orthodox, as well as the Arian of whatever shade of impiety to confess it alike. It said the Son was *like* the Father—and surely no one would deny that however unlike He might be in some respects, yet there was something at least in which He was like the Father. It was a creed, therefore, admirably constructed to allow conformity without faith. And this was just what the Emperor wanted; and therefore the Creed of Rimini became for a few years the creed of the empire, while the Creed of Nicæa remained the creed of the Church.

It was essential to the success of the imperial policy that the compliant or the heterodox should have pos-

session of the principal sees, so as to make them centres of the leaven by which the whole body might be leavened. Arian prelates were placed by intrigue and violence in Constantinople and Antioch, and strenuous efforts were made to displace St. Athanasius from Alexandria. That great saint, whose stainless character, inflexible orthodoxy, and indefatigable energy have extorted from the great sceptical historian almost the only sincere eulogy he has pronounced upon a Christian prelate, was alternately banished by one emperor and restored by another for a period of more than twenty years, and saw no less than three Arian bishops intruded into his see during his enforced absences. The disorders, the intrigues, the injustice, the violence, the insults, the murders, the tyranny incident to the attempt thus to revolutionize the Eastern Church, may be read in history. They would throw discredit upon the Christians, were they not so plainly and manifestly the deeds of the political power in its effort to enslave the Church.

The inherent weakness of Arianism as a positive belief was evident just as soon as Julian the Apostate succeeded Constantius, and proclaimed that contemptuous toleration by which he hoped to leave the Christian factions free to destroy each other, and the religion they professed. The people welcomed back their Catholic pastors with enthusiasm, and the Arians found themselves bereft of power and influence as soon as they ceased to be the tools of the Emperor. They obtained a temporary influence again under Valens, and again

threw the Church into disorder ; but under the lead of St. Basil the Church fought a good fight, and the contest came to an end when Theodosius obtained the empire, and the Council of Constantinople reaffirmed the Nicene Creed.

The Council of Constantinople (A.D. 381) marks the end of the Arian controversy. Just as soon as the Emperor gave up the attempt to force it upon the Church, the natural weakness of the heresy showed itself, and it fell into insignificance, although it remained the religion of certain Gothic tribes who had been converted from heathenism under its ascendancy. The mere politician or indifferentist may think the persistence of the Church to be bigotry, and the questions involved to be of small account ; the infidel may ridicule the distinction between *homoousios* and *homoiousios;* but the sincere believer, who trusts to our blessed Lord for salvation here and hereafter, who believes Him to be able to save to the uttermost because He is God, and who therefore worships Him as God—God of God, Very God of Very God—knows the importance of "the faith once delivered to the saints," and against the Rock of that faith, the waves of worldly policy dash in vain. The constancy of the saints had won the victory. The Emperor henceforth could have no influence in the Church, except as he professed her faith. Whatever the intrigues and tumults which disfigure the history of the Great Councils from this time on, this principle was settled ; and the sustaining power of the Church's Head,

and the guiding influence of the Holy Spirit, made the controversies and the scandals of which we read, the means to bring out the faith clearer and clearer by the successive expositions of Catholic dogma which they compelled.

Such, then, was the outcome of the imperial effort to make the Church politically useful by giving it a lax and flexible creed. The logic of events gave more success to the other measure I spoke of as implied in the effort of Constantine to annex it to the throne—the conforming the ecclesiastical organization to that of the empire. In an aristocratic state of society the idea of rank and precedence is a powerful factor; and when those who hold high office in the State are decorated with titles of nobility, it is but insisting on the equal dignity at least of the service of the Church, to give its chief officers similar titles of respect. That which would seem mere assumption under a simpler and more democratic policy is only proper and decent in this case. Little or nothing was done under Constantine himself in this direction. The sixth canon of the Council of Nicæa recognized the Bishops of Rome, Alexandria and Antioch, as possessing certain peculiar privileges, and the seventh gave an honorary precedence to the Bishop of Jerusalem. The Council of Constantinople advanced the bishop of that city above Alexandria and Antioch by its third canon: "That the Bishop of Constantinople have the prerogative of honor next after the Bishop of Rome, because Constantinople is New Rome." It also

made a closer approximation to the imperial organization by its second and sixth canons. I have already mentioned that Constantine divided the empire into four Prætorian Prefectures, these into thirteen *Dioceses*,* and these into about 120 provinces. The Council of Constantinople erected the great synod of the *Diocese* into a Court of Appeals, forbidding bishops to go outside with their cases, and thus constituted the bishop of the principal city, as president of that synod, an ecclesiastic of superior rank under the title of exarch or primate—exarch in the East, primate in the West. The direct influence of the emperor, however, does not appear until the Emperor Marcian procured from the Council of Chalcedon the completion of the Patriarchal system. Assuming that Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch were Patriarchates by the recognition of their privileges at the Council of Nicæa (though the canon of that council does not really admit that inference), the Council of Chalcedon, by its ninth, seventeenth and twenty-eighth canons, enlarged and fixed the patriarchal jurisdiction and privileges of the Church of Constantinople, giving it authority over the *Dioceses* of Thrace, Asia and Pontus, with the power of ordaining and requiring canonical obedience from the metropolitans of those *Dioceses*, and also the right to adjudicate

* The *Diœcesis* of the Empire, and of the Imperial Church must not be confounded with the modern Diocese, the jurisdiction of a single bishop. The modern Diocese is included in a province; the ancient *Diœcesis* included several provinces. Mistakes are constantly made in quoting the canon of Constantinople, through forgetfulness of this difference.

appeals in causes ecclesiastical from the whole Eastern Church. The Bishop of Jerusalem also obtained in this council patriarchal authority over Palestine. The organization of the Church was thus conformed to that of the empire, the patriarchs corresponding to the Prætorian Prefects, the exarchs, to the governors of the *Dioceses*, and the metropolitans to the governors of the provinces—the Bishop of Rome being given by an edict of Valentinian III, of the year 445, supreme appellate jurisdiction in the West, and the Bishop of Constantinople, by these canons of Chalcedon, supreme appellate jurisdiction in the East.

The intention of the Emperor in making the Archbishop of Constantinople the chief ecclesiastic of the empire, and as such the Minister of Religion in the imperial cabinet, undoubtedly was to rule the Church through him. The scheme was not a complete success. The imperial influence being much more direct in the appointment of the Patriarch of Constantinople than of the others, was exerted to procure as occupants of that see, persons of administrative ability and compliant disposition, rather than great theologians or able Churchmen ; and there are several instances, as Nectarius, Tarasius and Photius, where laymen who had been trained in the civil service were promoted to be bishops of the imperial city. The weakness of the patriarchs of Constantinople as religious leaders, through this subordination to the court, was fatal to their supremacy, and frustrated the attempt to enslave the Church through their instrumentality.

Dean Milman remarks that the Episcopate of St. John Chrysostom was the last attempt of a bishop of Constantinople to be independent of the political power, and that his fate involved the freedom of the Church of that city. The greatest preacher of Christendom and one of its purest saints, he was called by the influence of the favorite eunuch of Arcadius, the degenerate son of the great Theodosius, from being a presbyter of Antioch to the bishopric of Constantinople, that his eloquence might delight the people and glorify the court. But he was too honest, and too much in earnest to deal in flatteries of the great, or to connive at the sins of the powerful, and he speedily fell into disfavor with the Empress Eudoxia, for the boldness with which he rebuked her luxury and extravagance. In the meantime the Bishop of Alexandria was deeply offended at being reduced, by the canon of Constantinople above alluded to, from the second to the third rank, and was prepared to take advantage of any circumstance which might enable him to humiliate the Bishop of Constantinople. The occasion came in this quarrel of Eudoxia with Chrysostom. Theophilus of Alexandria, who was a bold and unscrupulous man, was called in to pass upon him an ecclesiastical sentence, and he willingly lent himself to the malice of the court, which held over him the menace of his own prosecution for offences of which he was accused, in case he failed to carry out its wishes. Chrysostom was unjustly condemned at the Council of the Oak, and under color of that condemnation he was

banished and died of the barbarous treatment he received in exile. His successors, having his example before them, were more prudent and politic; and though there were good and holy and brave men among them, the patriarchate of Constantinople was never able to assert itself against the imperial power.

Before we go on to consider the effect of the great Nestorian and Eutychian controversies upon the Church and upon the State, it is necessary to say something more about the imperial government as it was administered in the fifth century, and afterwards. Upon the death of Theodosius in 395, his sons, Arcadius and Honorius, succeeded him, the former ruling in the East and the other in the West. From this time forth, the East and the West were disunited, not again to be joined together in their whole extent; and what I have further to say in this lecture relates to the course of ecclesiastical history in the Eastern Empire. Arcadius was succeeded in 408 by his son Theodosius II., who reigned until 450, when he was succeeded by Marcian as the nominal husband of his sister Pulcheria. The dynasty of Theodosius came to an end in 457. The emperors had now become, through the reforms of Constantine, civil rulers, rather than military dictators. The feeble children of the great Theodosius were unable to command the armies, or to direct the policy of the empire; they were protected from destruction as well as deprived of influence by the etiquette and ceremonial of the court; the public business was carried on through

the machinery which had been invented for that purpose; it was designed as well to guard against the disasters invited by the weakness and folly of an incompetent sovereign, as to execute the will and increase the power of an able ruler; and it proved itself competent to accomplish both purposes.

The imperial government possessed two great advantages over all other governments then existing. One was the scientific administration of law and justice, the other was the regular system of the civil service; both of which provided a career for an educated laity, attached them to the existing order, and enabled them to control and to prompt the public opinion. And oppressive as were the burdens which the imperial government imposed upon the people, there was at least that regular administration which made their extent and effect calculable by the prudent foresight of the citizen, and that order which contrasted favorably with the disorder of barbarian rule—and all rule but that of the empire was barbarian. The administration and the empire therefore remained firm, though emperors were set up and put down by revolution after revolution, and dynasty succeeded dynasty after the third or fourth generation. The impulse given to lay education through the needs of the civil service was a powerful conservative influence in the East. M. Guizot, in his Lectures on Civilization in France, speaks of the numerous schools in Gaul in the fifth century, and of the support that was given to them by the government.

These schools shared in the decay of the Western Empire, because under the barbarian rulers they opened no professional career to the scholars; and I may remark in passing, that it is altogether unjust to charge the Church with responsibility for the ignorance of what are called the dark ages. The Church suffered severely from the calamities of the times; it did all it could (as Dr. Maitland has shown) to keep the light burning during that period of transition; and it was the most potent factor in the revival of learning, when society began to recover itself. In the East it was different. The permanence of the imperial administration ensured a career for the advocates, the judges, the secretaries, the accountants, the registrars of the empire, and the schools which became useless in the West flourished vigorously in the East. Theodosius II. founded a great university at Constantinople, endowing it with the means of employing fifteen professors of Greek and thirteen of Latin learning and literature, with two professors of law and one of philosophy. In the reign of Justinian it possessed a philosophical, philological, legal and theological faculty. The schools of Athens maintained their reputation for rhetoric and philosophy. Alexandria, in addition to its other faculties, was pre-eminent in astronomy and medicine. The school at Berytus was distinguished for the study of jurisprudence; that at Edessa for Syriac as well as Greek learning; at Antioch and elsewhere there were universities. The youth

who were ambitious of places in the public service or in the legal profession attended them, and profited by them; and there was for this reason, until a late period, an educated laity, as well as an educated clergy in the Eastern Empire. These educated laymen found their employment in the various government offices; they became familiar with the routine and system of the administration, and enabled it to work with regularity and order. In the department of law especially they were pre-eminent. Not only is the excellence of the Roman law admitted as an historical fact; but it has powerfully affected the jurisprudence of all modern societies. Even the Common Law, so called, though apparently antagonistic to what is called the Civil, that is the Roman Law, is admitted by those who are learned in legal antiquities to be indebted to it in many ways; while in those countries and states where the Common Law does not hold, the entire fabric reposes upon the solid foundation of the Codes of Theodosius and Justinian. While the emperors took to themselves the supreme legislative authority, and were able, as an abstract right, to ordain anything whatever to be law if they so pleased; yet by the systematic method of promulgating laws, by the procedure of the courts, by the reasoning of advocates, the authority of jurisconsults, and the reviews of courts of appeal, this abstract right was practically restricted, and the administration of justice was based on certain and well-known rules and maxims, which gave confidence and ensured stability

to the judicial system, and confirmed the authority of the judges, and of the empire of which they were the officials. The senate of Constantinople, again, possessed great authority in controlling the general administration, while the dependent position of its members prevented that authority being regarded with jealousy. The permanent existence of this body, which, by the legal fiction that Constantinople was New Rome, and therefore Rome itself, had been given the privileges of the senate of Old Rome, enabled it to establish fixed maxims of policy, and to make these maxims the grounds of the ordinary decisions of government. By these means a systematic administration was firmly consolidated.

On the other hand, however, there were elements of weakness and disorder—clay mingled with the iron of this stupendous organization. The government was entirely separate from the people; its interests were diverse from theirs, and it consulted their welfare no further than was necessary to secure its own ends. The people had no voice in determining the public policy; they had no influence in declaring war or making peace; they had no power of initiating or approving or rejecting proposed legislation; they made no grants of supplies; they were unable to refuse the extortionate demands of the sovereign, or to apportion the taxes that must be paid. The principal function of the people in the State was to furnish the means for the imperial expenditure, for the luxury of the

court, for the extravagance of the emperor and his favorites, for the expense of the army and the civil service, and, as the empire declined in power, for the subsidies of the barbarians. The taxes, therefore, were at all times oppressive, and sometimes ruinous. The efforts of the fisc, as Mr. Finlay remarks, were directed to sweep the entire surplus of produce, and the entire circulating medium year by year into the imperial treasury. Time was counted by the indiction of fifteen years, when a new valuation of the empire was made for the purposes of taxation. Every estate was taxed to the utmost, and to permit property to depreciate in value or productiveness was a crime against the emperor. The cultivator of the soil became attached to the soil; he could not leave it, because the proprietor was liable for his capitation tax, as well as for the tax upon the land; and this was the origin of serfdom. The members of a municipality, the *Curiales*, were jointly liable for the whole tax levied upon the community, and if one failed from inability to pay, the others must make it up; the duties of the *Curia*, therefore, became so onerous, that persons were willing sometimes to give away all their property rather than discharge them, and laws had to be passed to prevent their doing so. The proprietor of land could not enter the army, because it was his duty to work his land, that he might have wherewith to pay his taxes, and so the military spirit died out from the class that makes the best soldiers, the army was recruited from the lower

classes and the barbarian mercenaries, and the country, being destitute of a militia, lay open to the incursions of the barbarians. In this state of affairs there was no political public opinion, none of that healthy stimulus of political discussion which animates freemen, no possibility of intelligent patriotism or enlightened public spirit on the part of the citizen; even the interest in municipal affairs was destroyed, and the intellectual power of the people, deprived of its natural outlets in secular affairs, indulged a morbid appetite for theological wrangling, or for debasing superstitions.

Here I must interpose a parenthesis upon the genesis of superstitions. It is of course a commonplace of modern scepticism to charge the growth of superstition upon the clergy. The accusation is unjust. The superstitions which disfigure the "dark ages" were "survivals," as Mr. Tyler calls them, of lay heathenism. Mr. Finlay points out how it was in the East: "Under the jealous system of the imperial government, the isolation of place and class became so complete that even the highest members of the aristocracy received their ideas from the inferior domestics with whom they habitually associated in their own households—not from the transitory intercourse they held with able and experienced men of their own class, or with philosophic or religious teachers. Nurses and slaves implanted their ignorant superstitions in the households where the rulers of the empire and the provinces were reared; and no public assemblies existed where discussions

could efface such prejudices. Family education became a more influential feature of society than public instruction; and though family education, from the fourth to the seventh century appears to have improved the morals of the population, it certainly increased their superstition and limited their understanding."

Returning to our immediate subject, I remark that the history of the Eastern Church cannot be understood without taking account of such facts, as I have above alluded to. That the evils which affected the Church for many ages are to be traced to the imperialist scheme of Constantine, I believe to be capable of demonstration, and when we have Church historians of our own, who can survey the field from our American stand-point of an Apostolic Church free from state control, it will be demonstrated; and Church history will cease to be the puzzling and dreary record that it is in the hands of mere Anglicans, or German Neologists, or secular politicians. Not only is injustice done to several great emperors by viewing their characters through the mist of theological prejudice, without an appreciation of their difficulties as inheritors of a system that was too strong for them; but equal or greater injustice is done to the Churchmen of this period by a want of knowledge of the circumstances by which they were surrounded.

St. Cyril of Alexandria, perhaps, of all the Greek Fathers, has suffered most from this cause. The part he took in the condemnation of Nestorius for the

heresy which bears his name, has been misjudged, as if all the complications of the political situation with their consequences were to be laid at his door. Nestorius, like St. Chrysostom, had been a monk and presbyter of Antioch, and became Bishop of Constantinople by the favor of the court. But there the resemblance between the two men ends. Nestorius is represented as being more eloquent than wise, and a sentence he addressed to the Emperor in one of his sermons is quoted as showing his temper: "Aid me," he said, "against the heretics, and I will aid you against the Persians; give me earth cleared of heretics, and I will give you the Kingdom of Heaven." The crowd applauded, we are told, but wise men shook their heads. In a short time the hot-headed, self-opinionated man was himself involved in the charge of heresy. Modern writers are disposed to acquit him of an heretical intent or meaning; but I must confess that after a careful examination of what remains of his own words, my own opinion is that Nestorius was a Nestorian heretic. He objected to the term *Theotokos* (usually translated Mother of God), as applied to the blessed Virgin, and proposed that she be called *Christotokos* (mother of Christ), instead. With the remembrance of the Arian denial of the Divinity of Christ in their minds, the people took the alarm and excitement followed. For *Christos* either includes *Theos* or excludes it. If *Christos* includes *Theos*, then she who is *Christotokos* is *Theotokos*, and Nestorius' objection to the term is un-

tenable ; if, on the contrary, *Christos* excludes *Theos*, then Nestorius' objection is tenable ; but only on the condition that the Son of Man is not the Son of God. Nestorianism, therefore, divides our blessed Lord into two persons, and overthrows the Catholic faith, which teaches that He who was with the Father before all worlds, the only-begotten Son of God, is the same person who became man, of the flesh of the Virgin Mary, his mother, and who as man suffered for our salvation. St. Cyril saw the logical consequence at once. He wrote against Nestorius, and with oriental vehemence he issued twelve anathemas against the various expressions of the heresy. Nestorius replied with twelve contrary anathemas, and these anathemas, to my mind, demonstrate clearly the heretical character of their author. The controversy became so fierce that a General Council was called at Ephesus (A.D. 431) to settle it, and Nestorius was condemned. It is not necessary to go into the details of the history. The Council of Ephesus defined the Catholic faith, and upheld the truth upon the point in dispute ; and whatever we may say of St. Cyril and his methods, we must remember that the Court was in favor of Nestorius, that the Emperor's commissioners made one-sided reports of what was done, and so hindered St. Cyril from communicating with his friends that he was obliged to conceal his letter in a beggar's staff, and that the Patriarch of Antioch was lukewarm out of personal friendship for Nestorius. What I want to point out

particularly is that the political situation, with its effect upon the jealousy of the hierarchy and the temper of the people—the concealed discontent at the weakness and oppressiveness of the government, and the want of the power to express that discontent in any other way than by embittering a theological controversy in which the government took a side—had its influence upon the proceedings of the Council of Ephesus and the subsequent history of Nestorianism. It is an instance of what may be called (without irreverence, I hope), the irony of Divine Providence, that the man who promised his aid against the Persians in return for imperial aid against the heretics, should have originated a heresy which was used by the Persians as a weapon of offence against the empire. Adopted as the badge of nationality and disaffection by large numbers of the Syriac-speaking peoples on the borders of Persia, Nestorianism invited its patronage, and obtained its toleration, and became the exclusive form of Christianity in the regions beyond the eastern frontier of the empire.

Eutychianism (taking its name from Eutyches, a monk of Constantinople, and a partisan of St. Cyril against Nestorius) is the contrary error to Nestorianism. The one divided Christ into two persons, the other denied the integrity of the two natures of our blessed Lord, the Divine and human, either dissolving the human nature in the Divine, or blending the two into a mixture which is neither Divine nor human. Its

history further illustrates what I have said, but it had peculiar features, and is marked with greater violence. As Eutyches was a monk it was a monastic heresy. Now the monks, in the political condition of the East, were the army of the Church against the imperial despotism. Possessing the unbounded reverence of the people, and willing to endure martyrdom at any time, they were a power of which the government was afraid, and the worst mistake which could be made by a politician was to give a monk by persecution or death the opportunity of canonization. Monasticism had originated in Egypt, and the more fanatical members of the monastic brotherhood looked to the Patriarch of Alexandria as their chief, and were inclined to carry the opposition of St. Cyril to Nestorianism to the extreme limit. Hence the heresy. Under the circumstances the necessity of dealing with it was a political calamity of the utmost gravity. But the Church could do no otherwise than deal with it. I need not go over the story of its righteous condemnation at the Council of Chalcedon. You can read in Milman or Robertson about Eutyches and his partisans, about Dioscorus and the *Latrocinium*, about Flavian and St. Leo, about the murder of Proterius, about Timothy the Weazel and Timothy the White, and Peter the Fuller and Peter the Hoarse. My object is to show the connection of ecclesiastical with secular history, and how the scheme of Constantine entangled in its meshes men who would gladly have done right if they could. The emperors

who reigned during the Eutychian excitement were such men, and a few words given to each of them will not be thrown away.

It is a proof of the tendency towards a stable and legitimate government induced by the reforms of Constantine, that on the death of Theodosius II. without issue, Marcian, the Thracian, became emperor as the husband of Pulcheria, the sister of the deceased sovereign. The Christian feeling of loyalty to the powers that be, undoubtedly assisted in securing his throne. He was a soldier and senator of mature age, and high character. He shaped the policy of the Council of Chalcedon, especially with regard to the patriarchate of Constantinople; and while he confirmed the condemnation of Eutyches, he was disposed to leave to time and the force of truth the destruction of the heresy. He was really more interested in so organizing the hierarchy as to bring the Church into subjection to the Patriarch of Constantinople, and establishing the imperial authority through him, than upon persecuting the heretics. He seems to have contented himself with sending Eutyches away from Constantinople, and banishing Dioscorus from Alexandria. But the banishment of Dioscorus exasperated the monastic party, and they immediately began to agitate throughout the empire against the Council of Chalcedon. Proterius had been appointed Patriarch of Alexandria in place of Dioscorus; a Monophysite (the Eutychians were called Monophysites) named Timothy, and

nicknamed the Weazel, was set up against him; a Monophysite monk seized the see of Jerusalem; Peter the Fuller, another Monophysite, got possession of Antioch; and on the death of Marcian, Proterius was barbarously murdered.

Leo the Elder, the next emperor, found the Church in this disorder. He dealt with it with prudence; he took the opinions of the bishops by correspondence, instead of assembling them in council, and finding them adverse to Timothy the Weazel, he expelled him from Alexandria; and when he had made himself acquainted with the state of affairs, he put the sees into the possession of the orthodox bishops, and succeeded apparently in confining the Eutychian heresy to the monasteries.

The accession of Leo is another evidence of the improvement of the political condition, and of the rising influence of Christian feeling, notwithstanding the manifold evils in Church and State. Leo received the throne, in default of an heir to Marcian and Pulcheria, by the consent of the army and the senate, and desiring further to confirm his title by the sanction of the Church, he was solemnly crowned by the Patriarch of Constantinople—the first example of the coronation of a Christian prince. All that Robertson tells us of his secular affairs is that he procured the murder of Aspar, one of his generals, who had advanced him to the empire; and so he gives the most unfavorable view of his character. But it is to be remembered

not only that, according to the principles of the government, the emperor had the supreme power of life and death, and that his order made an execution legal without form of trial, when reasons of state were involved; but that Aspar was a barbarian, and that this was the age when the Huns under Attila, and the Goths under Alaric, Ataulph and Theodoric almost destroyed the empire; and Mr. Finlay points out that the removal of Aspar was necessary in order to reform the army, to reduce the dangerous power of the barbarian mercenaries, and to raise up a native soldiery, which the policy of preceding emperors had discouraged. He remarks also, that Leo's civil administration was conducted with great prudence, and that he endeavored to lighten the burdens of his subjects, and to improve their condition. His orthodoxy as a Churchman, and his prudence as a sovereign both conduced to the peace of the Church during his reign.

Leo was succeeded, after reigning seventeen years (457–474), by his son-in-law Zeno, as guardian of his grandson, who died an infant, and Zeno then reigned as the husband of Ariadne, who could confer the throne, though she could not inherit it. His claim was disputed by Basiliscus, the brother of Leo's widow, and he was driven out of Constantinople. Basiliscus made a party for himself by favoring the Eutychians, and the disputes broke out with more violence than before. But Acacius, the Bishop of Constantinople, an astute and able man, who seems either to have had

unbounded influence over Zeno, or to have been sincerely loyal to him, made use of the orthodox party among the monks to thwart the designs of Basiliscus, and in less than two years he was driven out, and Zeno was restored. The people had now been enlisted in the quarrel, and the monks did all in their power to inflame them; while the emperor and the bishops appear to have desired to minimize the excitement, and to smoothe the way for the return of the Eutychians, or Monophysites as they were now called, to the Church. Zeno and Acacius, after a correspondence with the bishops, issued an edict called the *Henoticon*, or bond of union, which affirmed the true doctrine, but did not insist upon the acknowledgment of the Council of Chalcedon; and those who accepted this were received to the communion of the Church of Constantinople. But the Bishop of Rome, to diminish the credit of Constantinople, immediately took up the quarrel, and the monastic party on either side refused to concede anything; and as the result of this attempt at peace, the Church at the death of Zeno was divided into three great parties: Rome and the West were Chalcedonian, Constantinople and Jerusalem favored the *Henoticon*, and Alexandria and Antioch were Monophysite. It is to be hoped that it was partisan slander which represents Zeno to have been exceptionally depraved and vicious in his private life. Finlay thinks that justice has not been done him as a ruler, remarking that the man who successfully resisted the schemes

and the forces of the great Theodoric, could not have been a contemptible emperor, even though his orthodoxy was questionable. He adds that the great work of his reign, which lasted seventeen years and a half, was the formation of an army of native troops to serve as a counterpoise to the barbarian mercenaries ; and that from his laws which have been preserved in the Justinian code, he seems to have adopted judicious measures for alleviating the fiscal obligations of the landed proprietors.

Anastasius, the next emperor, who was a man of mature age and of unblemished life, and who was greeted in the theatre with the cry, "Reign as you have lived!" secured his title by marrying the widow of Zeno. He was a man fit to be emperor, and yet the ill effects of Constantine's scheme for the union of Church and State clouded his reign, humiliated him to the lowest depth, and prevented a just appreciation of his merits and of the benefits he conferred upon the empire. He exerted himself to reform the administration, and to lighten the burdens of the people. He diminished the taxes, and yet by improved methods of assessing and collecting them he increased the revenue ; by judicious expenditure he was able to execute great works for the defence of Constantinople, and yet to leave at his death a surplus equal to about $70,000,000 of our money in the treasury. But unfortunately the only method of reform which presents itself to an able despotic ruler is that of increased centralization ; and

this conception of government attaches to his relation to the Church as to all other relations. The ecclesiastical administration of Anastasius, therefore, was a complete failure. His Archbishop of Constantinople, Macedonius, was a weak man, pious and amiable, but who had been selected for his compliant disposition, to carry out the policy of Zeno and the *Henoticon*. Anastasius was occupied for several years after his accession with the war against the Persians. On returning to Constantinople he found that Macedonius had been gained over by the orthodox monastic party, and that the city was zealous for the Council of Chalcedon. Its zeal found vent in insults to the Emperor, and he had to be protected by a guard of soldiers when he appeared in public. In his anger he imprudently showed favor to the opposite party. He laid a trap for Macedonius by procuring his subscription to a creed which made no mention of the Councils either of Ephesus or Chalcedon, and then he made it public. The orthodox party thereupon denounced Macedonius, and the Emperor seized the opportunity to depose and banish him. His successor renounced the Council of Chalcedon, and was acknowledged by the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem; so that it might seem as if not only the Emperor but the empire was Monophysite. Political passion was immediately aroused. Constantinople, which did not take kindly to the financial reforms and economical expenditure of Anastasius, being the place where much of the govern-

ment's money was expended, broke out into insurrection; and the Emperor, who was eighty years old, appeared in the Circus without the insignia of royalty, and offered to resign the throne. The tumults were appeased by his humiliation; but a Thracian general, Vitalian, took advantage of the situation to revolt, and marched upon Constantinople with 60,000 men, pretending to have taken up arms in defence of the Council of Chalcedon. The barbarian power, however, had been curtailed by the military reforms of Leo and Zeno, and Vitalian was defeated. Anastasius died emperor; but the memory of his good deeds as a civil ruler was lost in the animosities fomented by his unwise ecclesiastical policy.

Notwithstanding the religious ferment, however, the empire was strengthened by the firm and prudent rule of Marcian, Leo, Zeno and Anastasius, and Justin and Justinian reaped the benefits. Justin was severely orthodox; he put the episcopal sees into the hands of adherents of the Council of Chalcedon, and published severe laws against the heretics, thus stifling the controversy about the *Henoticon*. He acceded to the demand of the Bishop of Rome that the name of Acacius be removed from the diptychs; but as an offset he permitted the Bishop of Constantinople to assume the title of Ecumenical Patriarch. The heretical opposition, however, was still strong under Justinian, and he is credited with the politic arrangement of putting himself at the head of the orthodox,

and his wife Theodora at the head of the Monophysite party.

The reign of Justinian constitutes an epoch in the history of the Roman Empire. In it the scheme of Constantine culminated ; the power of the emperor was not only supreme, but was conceived of, not as formerly under the forms of the Roman Republic, but as simple, autocratic and self-centred. The codification of the Roman law in this reign is a monument of the legal learning and intellectual power which the emperor could call into his service ; but it vests all authority in the person of the sovereign, and has been studied in modern times in the interests of despotism, as well as in the interests of justice. The emperor had become a civil ruler, who directed all the operations of government in every department, and whose throne was hereditary when there were heirs, and elective when there were not. The army was kept in subordination by a distribution of commands which prevented its concentration under any one leader. The barbarian dismemberment of the empire was checked, and its inherent vitality enabled it to absorb the tribes which colonized its waste places ; while the victories of Belisarius and Narses extinguished the kingdoms of the Vandals in Africa, and of the Goths in Italy. The finances were administered with a rapacity which treated all the possessions of the people as the property of the emperor ; even the revenues of the municipalities were confiscated to the public treasury. It is not to

be thought that a sovereign so autocratic in all other respects could refrain from the attempt to dominate the Church; the determination of Justinian to make himself supreme in ecclesiastical affairs is quite as apparent as his wish to heal the religious dissensions by the ever-alluring and ever-deceptive expedient of compromise. This is the secret of his dealings with the Bishop of Rome after the reconquest of Italy, and of the frivolous question of the "Three Chapters" so-called, to determine which he assembled the Fifth General Council. The proceedings of that council were, in truth, a diplomatic struggle with the emperor, in which the Church evaded the snare that had been laid for her; and although some of its canons are of first-rate importance in the theology of the Incarnation, yet as regards the main subject for which it was convened, we may well acquiesce in the judgment of the learned French Catholic Dupin, that the Church was thrown into a wonderful confusion for a matter of very small consequence.

The net result, at the end of Justinian's reign, of Constantine's scheme for the union of Church and State, and for making the unity of the Church a support of the unity of the Empire, by a lax creed and an administrative subjection to the emperor, may be calculated with considerable accuracy. The fact was, that before the close of the sixth century, the nations and races, which were oppressed by or hostile to the empire, adopted heresy as their national religion; and

the Universal Church, so far as it was orthodox in the faith, was practically limited to those peoples whose speech was Latin or Greek, and who therefore furnished the officials of the administration. This tendency began to show itself at the first appearance of Constantine in the affairs of the Church. After the Council of Arles in the year 313, where the Donatist schism was treated of under his superintendence, and the decision was confirmed by his authority, the discontented and down-trodden remnants of the old Punic population of North-western Africa made the cause of the Donatists their own, and pillaged and murdered for the glory of God and the purity of the Church—the first Puritans in name, as well as in nature. The Goths and Vandals adopted Arianism to preserve themselves as a pure race, to prevent absorption into the empire, and to furnish a pretext for such insubordination or aggression as might be to their advantage. Nestorianism was favored in Persia, because it was under the ban of the empire. The Syriac-speaking inhabitants of the East were either Nestorian or Monophysite ; the Copts in Egypt and the Abyssinians were Monophysites, while the orthodox among them were called Melchites or Royalists. In the year 596, the Armenian Church, being under the Persian yoke, and finding conformity to the Church of the empire to be a political disadvantage, as exposing its members to persecution for disloyalty, formally re-

nounced the Council of Chalcedon, and is classed to this day among the Monophysite Churches.

The terrible effects of this disruption of the Church were fully evident in the political sphere when the tremendous energy of Mohammedanism threw itself upon the empire. The hosts of the false prophet could never have made their inroads upon Eastern Christendom, had the population been loyal to the government, and filled with the spirit of patriotism as well as animated with a zeal for true religion. As it was, the religious dissensions increased the disloyalty and indifference which the government had generated by its oppressive and rapacious tyranny. And the misfortune was, that the religious differences masked the real cause of the disaffection, and led emperors who were really desirous of the good of their people away from the reforms which might have bettered their condition and assured their loyalty, into further repetitions of the abortive attempts to heal the breach by political theology. The disloyalty seemed to be based upon religious disaffection, whereas in reality it caused that disaffection ; and therefore, as the physician was wrong in his diagnosis, he could not be right in the remedy proposed. It is no wonder that Heraclius, after the Persians had overrun the East as far as Egypt, and when the Mohammedan cloud began to loom upon the horizon, should make another effort at compromise. A great soldier may be pardoned if he does not see the bearings of a theological proposition ; but all the same

the Church would have been false to the trust committed to her, had she not branded the Monothelite heresy. Heraclius was a great general and a great emperor; but his theological blunder very sensibly increased the difficulties of his later years. The controversy raised by it was not brought to an end for half a century. In the Sixth General Council, Monothelitism was condemned, and its condemnation involved that of Pope Honorius who favored it.

The Iconoclastic controversy would furnish other facts illustrative of the position taken in this lecture, but I cannot go into it at length. Image-worship itself was Eastern rather than Western, and monastic rather than clerical. It took its rise from the political custom of showing outward reverence to the standards of the army, and the statues of the emperor. If it is right to salute the national flag, it is right to salute also the symbol of the Kingdom of Heaven; if it is right to do reverence to the image of the sovereign, it is certainly no less right to do reverence to the image of the Saviour. That was the whole question. In times of politico-religious excitement, such reverence shown on the one side, denied on the other, would be the badge of party, and the symbol of disaffection. The attempt to put down the use and cultus of images of the Saviour and the saints was suggested by the Mohammedan wars; and the whole miserable history shows how both parties were entangled in the net of Constantine's devising. But I cannot enlarge upon this. I must ask

your attention for a few minutes longer, whilst I attempt to sum up, as briefly as I can, the moral effect of the union of Church and State in the Eastern Empire, during the period of which I have taken a rapid review, upon the clergy and the laity of the Church—that is, upon practical Christianity.

First upon the clergy, and especially upon the bishops. The union of Church and State imposed upon the bishops many secular cares, and mixed them up with the politics of the government. It is plain that when religion is made an affair of state, it is the duty of prelates to be statesmen, and it may be their temptation to be demagogues. If St. Gregory Nazianzen, St. Chrysostom and St. Augustine were great saints, as they were, we must remember that neither St. Gregory nor St. Chrysostom were capable of ruling Constantinople, and that St. Augustine's episcopal see was a small town in Africa. St. Athanasius, St. Basil, St. Ambrose, Innocent I. and St. Leo were men of a different stamp, and had a different part to play; and Theophilus and Cyril and Dioscorus of Alexandria were men of a different stamp still. That Theophilus and Dioscorus were more fit for nobles of the empire than for prelates of the Church, their history manifests; and that the fair fame of St. Cyril is tarnished with political intrigue and demagogic violence cannot be denied. But there are no nobler nor greater men to be found anywhere than the class to which St. Athanasius, St. Basil, St. Ambrose and St. Leo belong. And as re-

gards the lesser men, and the men in lower stations, it is true that the power came to them and was not sought by them; it came to them because they were the only men who were able to exercise it in the general decline of society under the oppression of the government. The office and the power from which others shrank devolved upon them, and the population was saved from utter barbarism by the powerful influence of the Church. The bishop, as the defender of the curia and the real head of the people in the municipality, enjoyed extensive authority over the municipal corporations and the mass of the laboring population, gradually acquiring the power of a civil governor, the curia being his senate.* As the leaders of the people and the defenders of the Church, the clergy stood between the people and the government; and if at times they became subservient, and at times yielded to the temptation to become demagogues, we must remember that their circumstances were more difficult than any we are familiar with, and that the evils which affected the Church had their origin in the State. Our respect for the Churchmen of the East is vastly increased when we compare them with the Bishops of Rome as subjects of the Eastern Emperor. It was easy for the Bishop of Rome to pose as the Church's champion when he was under the protection of the Western Emperor or the Gothic King. But the

* Finlay, History of Greece, Vol. I., pp. 243–4, Vol. II., p. 25. I am indebted to Mr. Finlay's volumes all through this lecture.

feeble resistance of Liberius to Constantius, of Vigilius to Justinian, of Honorius to Heraclius, and the treatment of Martin by Constans II. show us against what odds the Church of the East contended for the faith once delivered to the saints.

As to the effect upon the people. The adhesion of Constantine to Christianity undoubtedly made the Christian religion fashionable, so to speak, and induced many to an external conformity, and a professed interest in Church affairs, which was not accompanied with a sincere desire to lead the Christian life. As time went on, the influence of the Church upon such persons and their descendants would at least improve their morals, and create such an opinion in favor of religious truth and right conduct as would and did react upon society for its improvement. But that improvement, and the real religious feeling of the people is not the matter of which ecclesiastical history is made. It is quiet and retiring and domestic, and does not appear upon the surface. History, as usually written, is after all like our daily newspapers, in which crime and immorality and the abnormal take up too much space, and the quiet, orderly life of the millions is unnoticed. In the conflicts with heresy, and the stormy scenes of politico-ecclesiastical commotion, the turbulent spirits make the noise, and the sincerely religious, who live by their faith, and who constitute the real strength of the Church, are little seen or heard of.

On the other hand, however, the reserved rights of the Church in matters of faith and doctrine, for which she had successfully contended throughout the Arian period, gave occasion to every discontented element in the body politic to assert itself whenever a theological question arose. Paradoxical as the assertion may seem to those who take a superficial view, theology was the only subject of general interest in which thought was free—in which there existed the constitutional right of opposition to the party in power. The outcome of the Councils of Nicæa and Constantinople was that the emperors were compelled to acknowledge the right of the Church herself to declare what her doctrine is ; and this acknowledgment constituted her the only bulwark of free thought against the despotic power of the government. In the absence of a political public opinion, which was impossible because the people had no real influence in the government, all the political animosities and discontents of the people turned themselves into the channel of theological discussion ; and it is a sufficient explanation of the acrimony of dispute, of the universal interest in the conflicts with the Nestorian, the Eutychian and the Monothelite heresies, and particularly in the Iconoclastic controversy, and of the turbulent commotions which accompanied them, and the scenes of violence which disgraced them, that they furnished the outlet for the pent-up political passion of those who cared less for Christian truth than for some safe way of showing opposition to the government.

Earnestness and zeal for the truth is one thing, political passion is another; and yet they may be mistaken, the one for the other. The *odium theologicum* is not a religious, but a politico-religious temper; and the change of temper apparent in religious controversy after the union of Church and State, not only among the ecclesiastics, but also among the people, was due to the political interests involved, and the political passions aroused, and cannot fairly be charged upon the Church —against which no such accusation can be sustained from the records of primitive Christianity, when zeal for the faith was just as strong, and the conflict with heresy as strenuous. The Church furnished the only means of a constitutional opposition in the body politic. We all know how, under a free political constitution, the rights of the opposition are secured in Congress or in Parliament, and the value to the commonwealth of the party out of power, in holding the party in power to its responsibility. No such political rights existed in the empire; and therefore all the passion and contention which in our system find a safe outlet in the recurring elections, spent themselves under the emperors in theological disputation, and occasionally in riot and murder for the sake of religion. This condition was hurtful both to the State and to the Church, and gives the enemies of religion occasion to blaspheme. While it tempted the clergy to insist upon coercion as a means to unity, it drew into the contest all the turbulent elements of society. When the emperor was orthodox,

the malcontents upheld the heresy ; when the emperor favored the heretics, they were moved to clamor the grievances of the orthodox ; and in consequence, the imperial policy, instead of using Christianity to sustain the throne by appealing to an enlightened and generous loyalty, wrought dissension, stereotyped differences, and was a powerful factor in the breaking up of the empire.

And yet this very condition of politico-ecclesiastical ferment was the working of the leaven in the three measures of meal according to our Lord's parable. It intensified the universal interest in Church affairs, and indirectly helped forward the growth of the better life among the mass of the people. It was better than the religious indifference which accompanies the cessation of religious controversy at the present day. The actual Church in any age falls far short of the perfection of the ideal Church, which is for all ages—for time and for eternity. But it may be that the actual Church, with all its imperfection, is doing its work better in that age and under those conditions which exist, than the ideal Church, could it have been realized, would have done. The Church is a field in which tares grow with the wheat ; it is a net which draws fish of every kind, both bad and good ; it is a leaven which by its fermentation leavens the whole lump. This may be our comfort under the difficulties of the present day—under our impatient sense of the want of ideal perfection in the Church as it now exists ; as well as our light in reading

the Church history of the past. As regards the Byzantine Church, with which we have had to do in this lecture, it is the testimony of a writer who has no theological bias, that the moral condition of the Byzantine Empire in the ninth century was superior to that of any equal number of the human race in any preceding period of the world's history; and that the superior moral tone of society was the conservative principle which prolonged its existence to so late a period, notwithstanding its manifold defects.* That moral superiority must be attributed to the influence of the Church upon the people; for there was no other power which could have evolved that result out of the unclean heathenism to which it succeeded.

* Finlay, Byzantine Empire. p. 258.

II.

THE ROMAN REACTION.

II.

THE ROMAN REACTION.

I have in this lecture to invite your attention to the history of the principal see of Western Europe during the time covered by the last lecture, and to show you how the same causes which threw the East into disorder acted, in a different way, but with as great potency, in promoting the aggrandizement of the see of Rome, and contributing to the rise of that political and ecclesiastical power which ultimately became the Papacy. My object in this lecture is not controversial, but historical; because I believe that to set forth the facts of history as I have read them and understand them, and to point out their bearings upon the development as it gradually unfolded, is a sufficient argument on any points of controversy that may suggest themselves.

It was a long journey from Nicæa to Canossa—from Constantine's invitation of Bishop Sylvester in 325 to the Nicene Council, to the deposition of Henry IV. of Germany by Pope Gregory VII. in 1076; and the footprints of the travellers are not washed out from the sands of time. Their monuments remain by the wayside to mark the path they trod; and we may learn

from the footprints and the monuments, what was their condition at the various stages of the journey.

I pointed out in the previous lecture, how, and under what influences, the hierarchy of the imperialist Church was built up as a pyramid, in narrowing stages, until it remained only to crown the whole with a single head. Beginning with the laity as the foundation, there rose in ranks above them, first the priesthood, then the bishops, above them the Metropolitans, ascending higher the Exarchs or primates, over them the Patriarchs. Who should be seated at the summit, supreme in power and dignity over the whole? In this question is contained the whole long struggle of Imperialism and Papalism. Given the determination of the head of the State to make himself also the head of the Church, there arises immediately the spirit of reaction, which erects a head of the Church (that is a head on earth, Christ Himself being the true Head of the Church) to oppose the usurpation of the State. The theory that the head of the State is, *ex officio* the head of the Church is Imperialism—I named it Byzantinism in the title of the last lecture; the theory that there must be an earthly, visible head of the Church, to govern both Church and State, is Papalism. The one theory produced the other, and the resistance to the one was the means of the success of the other. But inasmuch as neither Imperialism nor Papalism is a part of the Divine Order and Constitution of the Church, neither can be successful in establishing a complete

and ecumenical jurisdiction. Imperialism became dominant in the East, and Papalism in the West; and the result was the Great Schism of Christendom, never to be healed until Church and State are disunited throughout the length and breadth of the world, as they are in the United States to-day.

Here, however, I desire to interpose a remark by way of caution. In reviewing the history of a thousand years, including what are called the dark ages, we are called upon to take note of many things which seem to us to be corruptions in the Church. But in judging of them, we must remember that there is a variable as well as an invariable element in the organization of the Church, to enable it to adapt itself to the circumstances of a various and changing world; and that some adaptations which would really be corruptions among us, worked well in other and very different times. Moreover (and this is another consideration), a disturbing element having been introduced into the administration of ecclesiastical affairs, through the union of Church and State, it was impossible that the external history of the Church should not show its influence. Men with the best intentions, working under the actual conditions, and endeavoring to act for the best, added to the evils they attempted to remedy, and increased disorders which they desired to check. Instances of this have been seen in the previous lecture. It is a part of the same truth that measures looking to the reformation of manifest evils, attempts to adapt the

working of the Church to the exigencies of the times, changes of theory to meet practical difficulties, expedients honestly intended to remove confessed and palpable corruptions, have themselves become sources of corruption after they have outlived their term ; and it is shown in many examples, that the laudable effort of one age, has itself become a corruption in a succeeding age. Now it is a cheap and easy way of accounting for these phenomena, to attribute them to the corruption of the men themselves, to the ambition of prelates, to the ignorance and superstition of the priesthood, to the unbelief and hypocrisy of those who professed the faith in Christ. The temptation, so to explain them, is very great on the part of those who have broken with the historic continuity of the Church of Christ ; they are interested in having it so, to justify themselves in schism. But I believe that these explanations are for the most part not only false in themselves, but fatal to a true historical method. We shall better get at the facts of history by looking for the good in men, than for the bad in them. Believing, as I do, that the Papacy in its historical development is a falsehood in theory, and a corruption in fact, I can yet see that the men who contributed most to the formation of the theory and the working out of the fact were, in their measure, sincere, earnest, able men, righteously indignant at sins they sought the power to punish, and at corruptions they believed themselves commissioned to reform. I believe that God rules His Church, and has

enabled it to do its work in the souls of men under the most various and apparently hopeless circumstances; and that Christ is in His Church to sustain the faithful in one age as much as in another. I believe, however, that any tampering with the Divinely constituted order of the Church leads to practical evils which are only palliated by human expedients, however sincere and well-meant, and that these can be reformed only by a return to that Divinely constituted order. And it is with these beliefs that I purpose to comment on the history to which I have now to call your attention.

I touched briefly in the last lecture upon two or three points in the polity of the primitive Church, upon which I must here say a few more words.

1.—In the ante-Nicene period there was no such hierarchy of Archbishops, Exarchs, Primates, and Patriarchs, above the Bishops of the Apostolic Succession as was developed in the course of events already noticed. The rule was that of the 35th Apostolical Canon: "The bishops of every country ought to know who is the chief among them, and to esteem him as their head, and not to do any great thing without his consent; but every one should manage only the affairs that belong to his own parish,* and the places subject to it. But let him (*i. e.*, the chief) not do anything without the consent of all; for by this means there will be unanimity, and God will be

* Parish at this time meant what we mean by Diocese.

glorified by Christ in the Holy Spirit." The national, or in the early Roman Empire, the provincial Church had its chief bishop, but he was only a bishop (and the Pope of Rome to this day is nothing more) ; and he was not in all cases a Metropolitan. Three apparent exceptions to this rule are only exceptions in regard to the extent of the jurisdiction, not in regard to its nature. The Bishops of Rome, Alexandria and Antioch had larger territories than the rest ; but their authority in them was only that of the Apostolical canon,* and their subsequent development into the great patriarchates followed the course traced in the last lecture.

2.—The second point is, the completeness of the system under which, without a visible head, under the headship of our Lord Jesus Christ, the whole Church universal was bound together in visible unity, in the one faith, the one discipline, and the one order. Throughout the Church there were continually passing and repassing, duly accredited messengers of the clergy, bearing to the "chiefs" of each nation or province, letters written in an official manner—*literæ formatæ*—conveying intelligence of what was done in the provinces from which they were sent ; and, if the affair were of sufficient importance, or of general interest, asking the concurrence of the churches, or presenting a case for adjudication by the Church

* See my article in the Church Review for April, 1874.

Catholic. By means of these *literæ formatæ* duly received and preserved in the archives of the Churches, accurate information was everywhere obtainable of the condition and history of the whole Catholic communion; we cannot open the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius anywhere without seeing the use he made of them. By this means, also, the division was made between those who continued in the Church's unity, and those who broke it by schism or heresy. To give or withhold these letters, to receive or refuse them was the test of Catholic communion, and the sufficient means by which the authority of the Catholic whole was brought to bear upon the local church to reclaim the erring, or to cut off the contumacious. The rule was stated by St. Basil in a letter to the Bishops of Pontus, who had been set against him: "The fair thing," he says, "would be to judge of me, not from one or two who do not walk uprightly in the truth, but from the multitude of bishops throughout the world connected with me through the grace of the Lord. Make inquiry of Pisidians, Lycaonians, Isaurians, Phrygians of both provinces, Armenians your neighbors, Macedonians, Achaians, Illyrians, Gauls, Spaniards, the whole of Italy, Sicilians, Africans, the healthy part of Egypt, whatever is left of Syria; all of whom send letters to me, and in turn receive them from me. From the letters they send hither, and from those sent back to them, you may learn that we are of one spirit, of one mind. Whoso, then, shuns communion with me,

it cannot escape your accuracy, cuts himself off from the Catholic Church."*

3.—The third point is, the efficacy of this system for the termination of controversies, the definition of doctrine and the adjudication of cases appealed from any portion of the Church, by a truly ecumenical decision. By these means a judgment of the Catholic Church upon any matter was arrived at as fully and as accurately as by the assembly of a general council in later times; for example, on the Quartodeciman controversy, the Montanist heresy, or the Novatian schism. The assembly of the bishops in the national or provincial councils was thus given, so to speak, an ecumenical character; their communications with one another enabled them to collect at any place the concurrence of local decisions for a final settlement of a question which had arisen.

Now had there been no union of Church and State, there would have been, I believe, no need of any other polity for the Church than this of the ante-Nicene period. But when the emperor began to exert his power and influence in Church affairs, this primitive system broke down and new adjustments were necessary. When heretics or favorers of heretics were assisted in gaining possession of the Episcopal sees, and sustained in them by the imperial authority; when orthodox bishops were driven out by the military arm,

* St. Basil Ep. 204. Could the Bishop of Rome say more?

and unjust sentences of deposition were issued against such men as St. Athanasius by packed and partisan councils; and when time-serving or timid men were willing to hold communion with Catholics on the one side, and with heretics on the other, it ceased to be possible to obtain a Catholic exposition of doctrine, or to decide an appeal for right and justice by the means previously found sufficient. Two principal modifications of the ecclesiastical polity were necessary to meet the requirements of the situation.

1.—The first was an instrument for settling controversies upon doctrine as they arose. The assembling the Council of Nicæa by Constantine established the precedent, and the failure of the attempt to set it aside in the interests of Arianism or Latitudinarianism formulated the theory of a General or Ecumenical Council, as such an instrument. An Ecumenical Council is in theory an assembly of the bishops of the whole Church, brought together to bear witness to the truth as originally revealed to, and continuously held in the whole Church; and having the further function of establishing canons of discipline, as called for by the circumstances of the Church and the times. But inasmuch as in no Ecumenical Council were the bishops all actually assembled, and as political expedients might be (and were) resorted to to secure a prearranged decision, and a selection of bishops might be made to compose the Council, who were supposed or known to favor the desired decision, it was soon found

that the mere assembly of a Council, and the confirmation of its decrees by the emperor were not sufficient to guarantee its Ecumenical character. In process of time, therefore, it came to be seen that a General Council was not constituted by numbers (for several Councils larger than that of Nicæa are not allowed to be such); nor were its decisions binding upon their first publication; but that it needed to be accepted and ratified by the Church at large, as having been impartially summoned, as having the liberty to deliberate under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, and as bearing witness to the truth held and professed in the Church from the beginning. And so it was that in a controversy about doctrines, the last resort was to an Ecumenical Council, fully called, freely deliberating and generally received. It never entered into the head of any one in the early ages of the Church that the Bishop of Rome could establish a doctrine by virtue of his infallibility.

2.—The second adjustment needed was an appellate authority—a Court of Appeals, so to speak—to which a bishop or other member of the Church, oppressed by a partisan or heretical faction, could appeal from the unjust sentence of his own provincial synod. In the confusion wrought by Constantius there were many such cases, and the old method of appealing by letters to the consensus of the Catholic Church which was not disturbed by the local trouble,* was made impossible

* "Securus judicet orbis terrarum."—*Augustine.* See Newman's Apologia, p. 157.

by the new relation to the emperor. The head of the State was willing enough to accept this appellate jurisdiction ; but it was speedily apparent how dangerous it would be to concede it to him, and canons were made against "troubling the emperor's ears." I showed in the last lecture how this matter of appeals was regulated for the Eastern Church by the Councils of Constantinople and Chalcedon—an appeal being allowed from the synod of the Province to that of the *Diocesis*, and in the last resort to the Patriarchal throne of Constantinople ; but during the half-century succeeding the Nicene Council there was no settled rule, either in the East or the West. To some, as we shall see, it appeared the safe plan to make the Bishop of Rome the appellate authority ; and the persistent claim to that authority, founded upon a strained construction of certain canons of the Council of Sardica (A.D. 343),* was the means by which that prelate, aided by the circumstances of the times, attained his commanding position in the West.

During the progress of the Arian troubles, the Bishop of Rome was applied to, on several occasions, by those who were oppressed in the East, to represent their case to the Western Emperor, that he might exert a restraining influence over the Emperor of the East. St. Athanasius, who had been banished by Constantine, was restored at his death, by his son

* Usually assigned to the year 347 ; but see Robertson I., 226, note.

Constantine II., who ruled in Gaul, Spain and Britain, and was undisturbed as long as he lived. On his death, he was again banished, and retired to Rome, where by the influence of the western bishops he gained the ear of the Emperor Constans, who required Constantius to restore him ; which he did, and Athanasius remained in possession of his see until the death of Constans, when Constantius again displaced him. So on the accession of Valens, the bishops who held the Synod of Lampsacus, fearing persecution, applied to Liberius, Bishop of Rome, to secure the protection of Valentinian, the Western Emperor ; and later still, St. Basil and his adherents applied to Damasus of Rome, and other western bishops for the same mediation with the same Emperor. In the meantime, however, an attempt had been made to invest the Bishop of Rome with a real appellate authority. The Council of Antioch, which condemned Athanasius in 341, had passed certain canons, which virtually provided that the rehearing on an appeal should be before the authors of the original injustice ; and that if a bishop appealed to the Emperor he should have no hope of restoration. The idea of the Arians was to obtain, by imperial help, control of the Metropolitan sees, and by the operation of these canons, gradually to weed out the Catholic bishops. To prevent this, the Council of Sardica, which was held immediately after that of Antioch, enacted, as a temporary measure, that in case of injustice done to a bishop by a provincial synod, the

matter should be laid, "for the honor of the Apostle Peter," before Julius, Bishop of Rome, who should, in case he thought a rehearing necessary, name certain bishops from the neighboring provinces to sit as assessors, and also, if he thought it necessary, delegate one of his own presbyters to watch the case. The mention of Julius, Bishop of Rome, by name, shows that this provision was only intended for the time then being; since the authority so conferred would of necessity lapse at his death; and yet these canons were the starting-point for the assumption of all the power which the Roman bishops ultimately obtained.

But, just as a seed, in order to germinate, needs to be planted in suitable soil, and to have heat, air and moisture, so a claim of power and authority, which is new and in the germ, needs, in order to be successful, circumstances favorable to its success. Unless there are reasons why the public should favor it and advance it, it falls into ground barren and unfruitful. It is not sufficient for the historian, therefore, simply to mark the steps of growth; a philosophical view of the subject points out the causes and conditions of the development. There can be nothing more admirable in its way, than the complete and succinct review which Dr. Hussey compresses into three short lectures,* of the various steps by which the Bishops of Rome ascended to the Papacy; but the student of those admirable lectures

* Hussey's Rise of the Papal Power. Oxford, 1863.

must feel that something more is wanting than the account there given ; and that the facts brought forward need to be analyzed, and the causes which made the usurpation successful explained. A power and authority which were new were claimed by the party interested ; in some cases the claim was resisted and disallowed, in others it was successfully asserted ; the circumstances need to be understood, the causes which give it vitality, the conditions of its growth. Such causes, conditions and circumstances, in this case, I find in the union of Church and State, the reaction against the imperial despotism, and the need the Church had of a leader in that reaction. It is an easy and popular explanation, that the removal of the seat of empire from Rome to Constantinople left the field open for the Bishop of Rome ; that the Bishop of Rome put himself at the head of the barbarian kingdoms, and assisted their nascent civilization, and that he received his ample reward in their affectionate allegiance to him. But this explanation, though plausible and popular, is, like many plausible and popular explanations, insufficient and misleading. For the fact is, that the enormous expansion of the Bishop of Rome's credit and influence in the fourth and fifth centuries, arose out of the connection with the Eastern Church, and the part he was enabled to play in the controversies and disputes which distracted it. The Western Church was comparatively free from Arianism and unanimous in support of the Nicene Council, and the Western Emperor did not find

or make occasion to interfere actively in Church affairs. The Bishop of Rome, therefore, was free from the inconveniences to which the eastern bishops were exposed, and was able to act as the champion of orthodoxy against the Emperor of the East at less personal risk to himself, because he was out of his reach. It was to the interest of the Eastern Church, in its conflicts with the emperor, to make much of the bishop of the city which gave its name to the empire. And therefore, instead of casting in his lot with the new life of the West, the Bishop of Rome clung to the eastern connection as long as he could, and was, for a long time, thought a more considerable person in the East, than he was in the West.

But while the Eastern Church, in its contests with the Emperor, was willing to exalt the Bishop of Rome's authority, it was very jealous of his interference in its own proper affairs, and met every assertion of his supremacy with a distinct and decided negative. The canons of Sardica were never received in the East, and as soon as opportunity offered, the appellate system of the Eastern Church was arranged so as to exclude his interposition. And therefore, in studying the relations of the Eastern Church to the see of Rome, we meet with two classes of facts, which it seems hard to harmonize, and yet which are quite consistent with the situation. On the one hand we find expressions of oriental adulation and exaggeration applied to the see of Rome; on the other hand, we find a somewhat

unceremonious disregard of its assumptions. And we may safely conclude that the Eastern Church understood the Roman policy from the beginning, and was on its guard against it.

It stands to reason that the idea of a Roman supremacy in or over the Church should take root at Rome itself before it did elsewhere; and therefore it is quite important to know when and by whom the claim was first made, how it was received by the Church at large, and what circumstances limited it, as well as what enabled it to make progress against the opposition which its novelty provoked. Now we can put our fingers upon the precise point of time when the idea of a primacy of power in the Church—a supremacy, if you will—entered into the mind and policy of the Bishop of Rome. It was when Damasus succeeded Liberius. And the treatment by Damasus of St. Meletius of Antioch, and of St. Basil and his adherents, under the persecution of the Emperor Valens, opened the eyes of the Eastern Church at once to the nature of his pretensions, and made it forever after watchful and suspicious of the encroachments of his successors.

When Julius of Rome wrote to the bishops of the Council of Antioch in 341, that instead of proceeding as they had done against St. Athanasius and the others, "word should have been written of it to us all, that so a just sentence might proceed from all," it is plain that he had no idea of anything else than the old system of the ante-Nicene Church. It was against this Council of

Antioch that the Council of Sardica passed the canons I have spoken of. While Liberius was bishop—he who was banished by Constantius, and who after two years of exile failed in constancy and consented to the condemnation of Athanasius—there was no opportunity to assert the prerogative, even in the form which the Council of Sardica granted it. But when Damasus succeeded to the Roman pontificate (Oct. 1, 366), the idea of an executive and appellate authority over the Church entered with him into possession of the Roman see, and became a part of its tradition and policy. Several circumstances concurred to favor it at this time, and I must ask your patience to permit an explanation of them. In 364 Valentinian became Emperor. He was a successful general, and for military reasons selected the West for his dominion, committing the empire of the East to his brother Valens. The two brothers seem to have pursued different policies in matters of religion ; while Valens attempted to compel the orthodox to hold communion with the heretics, Valentinian pursued a course of non-intervention in Church affairs, except so far as was necessary to keep order in the State. But the condition of the Church of Rome on the accession of Damasus compelled the authorities to have recourse to the Emperor. His election was disputed, a faction set up Ursinus against him, and the dissension grew so fierce as to lead to riot and bloodshed and slaughter. The Emperor restored order by banishing the faction of Ursinus, and confirmed the

authority of Damasus by several decrees, among which was one that enacted (if the words are a quotation, as they seem to be) that "the pontiff of religion with his assessors should judge concerning religion"—a translation, apparently, into legal language, of the provisions of the Sardican canons.

Now this term "pontiff" inserted in an imperial decree, and given thereby a legal value, is a matter of much more importance than appears at first sight. In law, words are things, and are subjected to legal manipulation, extending or limiting powers as the lawyers determine. This decree, therefore, enabling the Bishop of Rome to assume the legal title of "pontiff," permitted the pretension that the powers of *Pontifex Maximus* in the Roman State appertained to him so far as the Christian religion was concerned—especially after the Emperor Gratian abdicated the office, as we are told he did. It is curious that Damasus is called "the pontiff" in various documents of the time; and it may be permitted to conjecture that being not only an astute politician, but a man of some literary affectation, he had adopted it as the Latin equivalent of the Greek *Episcopus*, and had the adroitness to secure its insertion in the imperial rescripts for which he had to petition, to be delivered from the party of Ursinus. However this may be, and whether Valentinian used this particular term or not, it is certain that Theodosius did, in that famous decree which he issued in 380, on taking the government of

the East: "We would have all the nations whom our gracious government rules, to be of that religion which the Apostle Peter is proved to have delivered to the Romans, * * * which also it is plain the Pontiff Damasus follows, and Peter, Bishop of Alexandria," etc., etc. It is unquestionable that the term is given to him in this decree, as a legal title; and the effect of its legal use, as a distinctive appellation, upon the position of the Bishops of Rome could not fail to be great, seeing that they knew how to take advantage of it.

It was a great thing for the Bishop of Rome, that the Emperor acknowledged him to be Pontiff, and made his faith the rule of orthodoxy for the empire. But there is something more to be noticed in this decree of Theodosius. The Emperor adduces the faith of Peter of Alexandria, as well as of "the Pontiff Damasus," to certify the religion which "the Apostle Peter delivered to the Romans." Now it is natural to understand by "Romans," the members of the local Church of Rome; but if that be the meaning, why is Peter of Alexandria associated with Damasus as a witness to it? Let us remember that as far back as the early part of the third century, Caracalla had bestowed the Roman franchise upon all the free inhabitants of the empire, thereby making them citizens of Rome; and let us remember also that the Bishops of Rome, in their controversies with the patriarchs of Constantinople, claimed that Antioch and Alexandria

should take precedence of Constantinople, because their Churches, like that of Rome, were founded by St. Peter, the former by the Apostle in person, the latter by his disciple St. Mark. Now the Church of Antioch at this time was in dispute between Meletius and Paulinus, and therefore could not be referred to in Theodosius' decree; but the associating Peter of Alexandria with Damasus shows that Theodosius meant by Romans, not the actual inhabitants of the city, but the possessors of the franchise throughout the empire. It was easy therefore to infer that as "Pontiff" and Bishop of Rome, Damasus was in a certain sense, Bishop of the Romans, *Pontifex Maximus* and so regulator of the religion of the empire.

And that was what Damasus intended to be, as his conduct with respect to St. Meletius of Antioch showed. Scarcely a year had passed, however, before Theodosius discovered important reasons for modifying his decree. At the time of its publication he was at Thessalonica, and the Bishop of Thessalonica, Ascholius, had special relations with Damasus. Macedonia and Achaia had up to this time been attached to the Western Empire, and Ascholius had attended the Western Councils; but Gratian, when he appointed Theodosius Emperor of the East attached these countries to his government for military reasons, and so Ascholius became associated with the Eastern Church. Damasus therefore made him the medium of communication with the East, and trusted to him for information concerning its

affairs, and in this way drew him under his influence. Theodosius while at Thessalonica had a severe illness, during which he received baptism from Ascholius ; he therefore naturally consulted him with regard to the Eastern Church, and so his decree reflected the ideas of Ascholius and Damasus. But shortly afterwards the Emperor went to Constantinople, and there met St. Gregory Nazianzen, who gave him a better account of the Eastern Church and its relations with Damasus ; whereupon he issued another decree of different tenor, and in a short time assembled the Second General Council to settle the affairs of the East.

Here I have to ask your attention to an episode in Church history, which is really the key to the relations of Rome and the East for all subsequent time, and which is not given by the historians the importance it deserves. In the last year of the reign of Constantius (A.D. 361) a Council of the politico-ecclesiastical party which was supported by the Emperor, transferred Eudoxius, who was the head of that party, to Constantinople, and made St. Meletius Bishop of Antioch in his place. In a few days they found out that they had made a mistake ; for Meletius was orthodox, and as soon as he had gained the attention of his flock, began to preach the Nicene faith. He was therefore deprived and banished, but returned to Antioch on the accession of Julian. At the same time Athanasius returned to Alexandria, and with him there came two western bishops, Eusebius of Vercelli, and Lucifer of Calaris,

who had been exiled to the Egyptian desert some years before by Constantius. These two were sent by Athanasius to Antioch to labor for the peace of the Church ; but Lucifer, being a hot-headed man, refused to communicate with Meletius, and consecrated a presbyter, named Paulinus, to be Bishop of Antioch. * Paulinus had been the minister of a congregation which remained firm through all the preceding troubles, and therefore Athanasius could not reject his communion, though he regretted his consecration, and would have been willing to acknowledge Meletius, to whom the orthodox East were devotedly attached. There was thus a schism among the faithful, Egypt acknowledging Paulinus and the East Meletius, while the West stood aloof from both. Matters were in this state when Valentinian and Valens became Emperors ; and Valens not only threw his influence in favor of the Latitudinarian party, but sought to compel the orthodox to communicate with heretics of all sorts. He expelled again all the bishops banished by Constantius who had returned under Julian, and Meletius with the others was sent into exile. A persecution now raged all through the East, vivid pictures of which, and of the misery and confusion it wrought, are given in the letters of St. Basil, and in the ecclesiastical historians. Not only were orthodox bishops displaced and compliant tools put in their stead, but friendships were

* This Lucifer, on returning to the West, became the founder of a sect called Luciferians, which gave Damasus much trouble.

broken, confidence was abused, weak men turned traitors and tricksters made gain of lack of conscience, the steadfast were wounded by false friends as well as open enemies, and the faith was in danger of perishing through proscription professedly in the interest of toleration.

In this state of affairs there was, humanly speaking, but one door of hope for the down-trodden orthodox East. It was not without risk for subjects of the Eastern Empire to appeal to the Emperor of the West, but it might be done if the Western Church would take up their cause. Two deputations were sent into the West while Liberius was Bishop of Rome, one in 364, and another in the spring of 366, to solicit such mediation of the western bishops with Valentinian as would induce him to restrain Valens. They were kindly received, but there was no opportunity of reaching the Emperor, who was engaged in military operations against the Germans, and they had to be content with the *literæ formatæ* that were granted them.

Matters were in this condition when Damasus succeeded Liberius; but his own affairs were in such a state that Damasus had neither power nor inclination to exert himself in behalf of the East. The persecution continued unchecked, and unabated. In 370 St. Basil became Bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia. He immediately revived the plan of seeking union with the West, and so of reaching the Western Emperor. He

wrote to St. Athanasius, who was all-powerful at Rome, pleading that he would recognize St. Meletius, and send some of his own ecclesiastics with his messenger to the West; since, if the East and the West were united, "the Rulers [*i. e.*, the Emperors] would respect the faithfulness of the multitude." * Athanasius so far acceded to this request as to send a messenger to Rome, who, on his return, was accompanied by a deacon named Sabinus with letters to Athanasius, which he sent to St. Basil and his friends. Encouraged by this little, St. Basil and the friends of Meletius wrote other letters to the West, which they sent back by Sabinus, asking that the bishops of the West would send a deputation to visit the Churches. No answer was returned; but the next year the letters themselves were sent back as unsatisfactory, and it was intimated to the writers that if they wished for any help from the West, they must write in a form dictated by Damasus himself. † Wherein they were defective does not appear; but there can be little doubt, from St. Basil's expressions in his subsequent letters, that what was wanted was some acknowledgment of the Roman "pontificate," according to the new ideas of Damasus. St. Basil was deeply disappointed, and expressed his opinion freely on the pride of the Roman bishop, and although some of his friends were in favor of another embassy, he would not consent to it, and nothing more

* St. Basil, Ep. 66. † St. Basil, Ep. 138.

was done for two years. Damasus now seems to have felt it necessary to put some pressure upon the friends of Meletius, and in 375 he wrote a letter to Paulinus of Antioch, acknowledging him, and making him the medium of his communications with the East. I must quote the sentence in which St. Basil announces this intelligence to Meletius, still in exile. "Letters have reached us," he says, "signifying that there have been brought to Paulinus and his party several epistles from the West, as if tokens from some principality, and that the chiefs of his faction thought great things, and glorified themselves with these letters; then that they set forth a creed, and with that were ready to enter into communion with our Church."* About this time Valentinian died, and his son Gratian, still a youth, became Emperor of the West; and some of the Easterns seem to have thought the time propitious for another effort. They proposed that St. Basil's brother, Gregory of Nyssa, should go to Rome; but St. Basil objected, asking "what benefit would there be to the common cause from the approach of such a man, whose manners are foreign to slavish flattery, to one high and lifted up, and sitting somewhere aloft, and for that reason unable to hear those who from the ground call out the truth to him."† In 376, however, certain presbyters went to the West, and St. Basil wrote a letter by them to the bishops of Gaul and Italy. "At

* St. Basil, Ep. 216.

† St. Basil, Ep. 215.

different times in the past," he says, "we have called upon your love for support and sympathy; but because the vengeance was not fulfilled, ye were not permitted to assist us. Our chief desire is that through your considerateness our confusion be made clear to the Ruler of your world [*i. e.*, to the new Emperor Gratian]; but, if this be difficult, that some of you come to us for visitation and comfort of the afflicted, that they may be eye-witnesses of the sufferings of the East." Some kind of an answer was returned, and other letters were written the next year; but beyond an acknowledgment of them by Damasus nothing was done. In 378 Valens was killed in battle against the Goths. Gratian then made a decree permitting all who had been banished for religion to return to their homes; among the rest St. Meletius returned to Antioch, where he held a Council of 146 bishops, who made a statement of their faith, which they sent into the West. In January 379, Theodosius became Emperor of the East, and now that both Emperors were orthodox, the West awoke from its apathy. The western bishops proposed that Meletius and Paulinus should together rule the church of Antioch, and that a Council should be held at Alexandria to settle all other affairs. But the East was naturally suspicious of this new-born zeal, and both propositions were respectfully declined.

Such was the situation when Theodosius came to Constantinople in the winter of 380–1. There, as I

said, he learned from St. Gregory Nazianzen the truth concerning the Eastern Church, and superseded his decree of the year before, making the faith of "the pontiff Damasus," and of Peter of Alexandria the test of orthodoxy, by another decree commanding that the churches be delivered to "the orthodox bishops who hold the Nicene faith," and defining a holder of the Nicene faith to be one "who confesses the omnipotent God, and Christ the Son of God to be one in name, God of God, Light of Light; who does not violate the Holy Spirit by denying Him; who acknowledges the undivided substance of the incorruptible Trinity, which in the Greek language is called *οὐσία*.* Theodosius then summoned the bishops to Constantinople to form the Second Ecumenical Council, and when St. Meletius arrived in that city, he received him with such marked favor that it seemed necessary to account for it by the fable that before his elevation the Emperor had a prophetic dream, in which Meletius handed him the insignia of sovereignty. St. Meletius presided at the Council until his death; after which the Council consecrated Flavian to be his successor. But the Westerns objected to this, as to all else that was done at the Council, and continued their opposition until the suc-

* By this word *οὐσία* Theodosius excluded *hypostasis* from being a test word. Some of the Easterns took *hypostasis* in the sense of *subsistence*, others in the sense of *substance*. The one side asserted *three* hypostases in the Trinity, the other only *one*. This was not a question of heresy, but only of the use of a word.

cession of Paulinus died out, drawing down upon themselves on more than one occasion the sharp rebuke of Theodosius. Theodoret tells us that the schism lasted for seventeen years—that is, from the letter of Damasus to Paulinus, in 375, to the death of Evagrius, his successor, when the East made good its position against Rome, and peace was restored.

Now it was under these circumstances, and with a full consciousness of the Roman claim, based in the first instance upon the canons of Sardica, but enlarged by the ambition of Damasus, and with a firm determination to erect a barrier against it, that the Council of Constantinople passed its famous canons, giving Constantinople the second rank, "because it is New Rome," making the synod of the *Diocesis* the receiver of appeals from the provinces, and prohibiting the invasion of one *Diocesis* by the bishops of another. The treatment which the East had received from Damasus, his evident attempt to assert an authority over it as the price of his active intervention, his cold, unsympathetic and selfish neglect of the suffering churches in their hour of need, his sudden activity when the danger was past, and his attempt to unsettle the settlement of the Council—these things opened the eyes of the bishops of the East to the Roman policy, and determined them to put an effectual bar in the way of any future assertion of Roman supremacy. And in all subsequent history, the East never forgot the lesson it had been taught by this episode of Damasus and Meletius.

I have dwelt upon this passage of Church history at greater length than agrees with the scale of these lectures, because of its importance as marking the beginning of the Roman claim of supremacy, its relation to the constitution of the empire, and its rejection from the very first by the East. This claim was the special tradition handed down by Damasus to his successors, and it suffered no diminution in the hands of such men as Innocent I., Celestine and Leo the Great. As I read Church history, the claim originated with Damasus; but once consciously adopted, it was used to impart a new meaning to the acts of ecclesiastical intercourse which were customary in the Church, and to throw back its shadow upon the past by misinterpreting its records.

And therefore, in studying this period of Church history, it is very necessary to observe, not only what the bishops of Rome claimed, but how their claims were received and met by the Church at large. It is evident that when new ideas enter a system at any centre which is powerful enough to give them currency, while the old ideas rule in the surrounding environment, the same act will be differently interpreted by the different parties. That which was done with a definite intent according to the old ideas, will be twisted to a new meaning by those who are engaged to advance the novel theory; and, *vice versa*, the act done with a definite intent to establish the new claim may be unsuspectingly allowed as a customary transaction of the old system. The polity of the primitive Church was subjected at this

time to this double interpretation, and as circumstances favored the pretensions of the Roman see, it was gradually transformed by infusion of the new ideas into the old practice. Things were done as they always had been done, but a new meaning was put upon them; and that which had been the common right of all bishops was considered a special prerogative of the Bishop of Rome.

1.—Thus, for example, the ordinary *literæ formatæ* informing the bishops of the Church generally of the transactions in any particular province were taken by the Bishop of Rome, when they were sent to him, as an application for the confirmation of a sentence by pontifical authority, or as the appeal of an aggrieved party for a rehearing; or, if the decrees of a Council were communicated for information, they were assumed to be submitted in order that they might obtain the force of law by his approval; whereas there had been no such intention on the part of those who sent them. The typical instances are those of the African Church in the affairs of Pelagius and Celestius, and later of Apiarius. Pelagianism, as a heresy, affected the whole Church; the Africans therefore reported their condemnation of it to Innocent I., of Rome, asking him, according to the ceremonious mode of address of the time, to affix to the statutes of their humility, the authority of the Apostolic see. Innocent replied, congratulating them on knowing what was due to the Apostolic see, and concurring in their sentence. But some time after, Celestius appeared

at Rome, and appealed to Zosimus, Innocent's successor, for a reversal of his condemnation; and Zosimus, agreeably to the principle that appeals must be encouraged by a decision, if possible, in favor of the appellant, took up his cause, and would have pronounced his acquittal, had not the Africans, whose great light was St. Augustine, possessed sufficient influence at court to procure an imperial decree condemning the heresy; whereupon Zosimus wrote to Africa that he held the matter under consideration, and shortly after he condemned Celestius, covering up his retractation with the assertion that the bishops of Rome inherit from St. Peter a divine authority equal to St. Peter's, so that no one can question their decision. The Africans, however, paid no attention to this claim of Zosimus, having previously informed him that as the cause arose in Africa, he could take no cognizance of it. The case of Apiarius had a similar result. He had been degraded by his bishop for immorality, and appealed to Rome. Zosimus commanded his restoration, and the Africans refused. Zosimus sent a legate to enforce his decree, who quoted the Sardican canons as belonging to the Council of Nicæa. The Africans thereupon sent to Constantinople, Alexandria and Antioch for correct copies of the Nicene canons, and finding them to agree with their own copies in not containing the alleged provisions, they requested the Bishop of Rome to relieve them of the presence of his legate, both then and for the future.

2.—So again, when the number of Councils and the canons they enacted increased as they did in the fourth century, the bishops of outlying or secluded districts would naturally have recourse to some well-informed authority to learn what the rules were. When St. Amphilochius was made Bishop of Iconium in Pisidia, he wrote to St. Basil for instruction in the canons, and St. Basil sent him in reply his three canonical epistles, so called. In the same way, Himerius, Bishop of Tarracona in Spain, wrote to Siricius, the successor of Damasus, for information of the same sort, and Siricius replied with a letter of precisely the same character as St. Basil's. But because Siricius was Bishop of Rome, his letter is set down as a *decretal* epistle ; as if the Bishop of Rome, instead of telling him what the law was, or what he thought it was, had enacted it by his own authority. And so we are told in the histories, that this letter of Siricius is the first authentic decretal. It was in fact, so far as appears, the first decretal ever issued by a Bishop of Rome—truly not a decretal at all ; but, for all that, the origin and foundation of that whole mass of decretal law, by which the Papacy profited so much in after times.

3.— Once more : When Ascholius of Thessalonica acted in correspondence with Damasus in the affairs of the East, he had no idea that he was being made a Vicar Apostolic of the see of Rome ; and yet his alliance with Damasus was made the precedent for a claim of jurisdiction over Eastern Illyricum, and each

succeeding bishop of Thessalonica was duly furnished with letters committing to him the powers (*vices*, whence *vicar*) of the Apostolic see. And so the precedent was established upon which the doctrine was built up, that the Apostolic Vicariate constituted the bishop who exercised it the primate of his *Diocesis*, and that the nomination to the primacy of a national Church in the West was the prerogative of the Bishop of Rome. Eastern Illyricum (that is, Macedonia and Greece), because of its peculiar relations both to the East and the West, was so situated as to allow the precedent to be established there. The extension of the idea was permitted in Gaul by the dissensions of the churches of Arles and Vienne, in which Leo the Great dealt so hardly with Hilary of Arles. Thence it advanced into Spain; it went with Augustine into England; from England it was taken by Boniface into Germany, and so it spread over the West. The East always rejected it.

The case of Hilary of Arles is important because it produced the imperial decree which really established the Western Patriarchate. It was an incident in a long contest between Arles and Vienne, important cities in Southern Gaul; and the story shows the policy of Rome in fostering appeals by favoring the appellant whenever it was possible to do so. There were two questions involved, one the right of Arles to be the metropolis of a province, which Vienne denied; the other the right of Arles to the primacy of Southern

Gaul, which Vienne also denied. The dispute continued from the pontificate of Innocent (about A.D. 400) to that of Symmachus (about A.D. 500), and as I have not time to tell the story, I shall merely remark that the Bishop of Rome received appeals alternately from the Bishops of Arles and Vienne, and usually decided, without any care for consistency, in favor of the appellant. This is Dr. Hussey's summary of this case: "Zosimus," he says, "made a new regulation, professing in that to restore the rightful primitive custom of Apostolic times; Popes Boniface, Celestine and Leo condemned this, and set it aside. Leo called it a temporary arrangement, and by a decree of his own ordered that Arles should be subject to Vienne; and then, after a few years, ordered something different, which was a kind of compromise between the two claims. Anastasius had changed this again; and now Symmachus revoked Anastasius' acts, on the ground that all the ordinances of St. Peter's chair must be perpetual and unchangeable." In the course of this dispute and the matters growing out of it, Hilary came into collision with St. Leo, planting himself upon the rights of his see, and refusing to accept Leo's regulations. Leo thereupon procured an imperial rescript, confirming, or rather conferring upon him—since it had no real existence before—the patriarchal authority over the West: "We decree, by a perpetual sanction, that nothing shall be attempted against ancient custom by the bishops of Gaul or other provinces, without the

authority of the venerable Pope of the eternal city: but whatever the authority of the Apostolic chair ordains shall be law to them; so that if any bishop when summoned shall omit to come to the court of the Roman bishop, he shall be compelled to come by the governor of the province."

But this patriarchal authority over the West, with which the Bishop of Rome was invested by the weak and worthless Valentinian III., speedily fell into temporary abeyance. Within thirty years from the date of this decree, the last Western Emperor was deposed, the insignia of sovereignty were sent to Constantinople, and the Emperor of the East was informed that the one ruler of the world needed no colleague, since his barbarian servants or allies would relieve him of the care of his western dominions. In the troublous times which saw the establishment of the new kingdoms of the West, there was little opportunity for the exercise of patriarchal jurisdiction, and the decree of Valentinian became obsolete.

It is somewhat difficult for the student of such a manual as Robertson, for example, unless he is very well read, to connect the secular with the ecclesiastical history of the times. How many of us remember that just at the time St. Chrysostom was banished from Constantinople by the hostility of the Empress Eudoxia, the Emperor Honorius was driven by the fear of Alaric to transfer the seat of government in the West from Milan to Ravenna; that when Pelagius was publishing

his heresy, and Augustine took up his pen to fix the theology of the West for so many ages, Alaric was besieging Rome for the third time; that by the time Pelagianism was condemned, the Goths had entered Spain; that while the Council of Ephesus was dealing with Nestorius, the Vandals were conquering Africa; that during the interval between the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon, the Franks had passed the Rhine, and the Saxons had begun their descents upon Britain; that in the year of the Council of Chalcedon one of the decisive battles of the world was fought, and Attila was defeated by Aetius and Theodoric upon the field of Chalons? Perhaps we do remember that while St. Leo was protesting so energetically against the decrees of Chalcedon which made Constantinople supreme in the East, he was sent on a mission to Attila to turn him from his purpose of destroying Rome, and that he succeeded; but are we so sure, without looking up the chronology, that it was in the pontificate of Leo, that Genseric the Vandal took and plundered the eternal city? And yet the secular and the ecclesiastical history are connected more closely than might appear at first sight.

The ruinous policy of the government, which destroyed all political freedom, ground down its subjects by taxation, reduced the free tillers of the soil to the position of serfs fixed to the land, and prevented their entering the army, lest their capitation and land-tax should be lost, made it necessary to fill up the armies with the

bands of barbarians. These barbarians were astute politicians as well as able soldiers ; they had a keen eye to their own interest ; and they understood that so long as they kept themselves from absorption into the mass of the subjects of the empire, they were the arbiters of its destinies. They were Arians, therefore, partly at least for political reasons, to keep up the distinction between the Barbarian and the Roman ; and while they were willing to take service under the empire, they were just as willing to have a grievance against it, when advantage was to be gained thereby. And so it came to pass that the orthodox empire depended for its defence upon those whom its laws subjected to persecution, whenever it was strong enough, or foolish enough to persecute them. Under these circumstances it was the crowning act of folly in the weak and foolish Honorius, after the murder of Stilicho, his ablest statesman and best general, to publish a decree excluding all but Catholics from the service of the State. That decree, followed up by an infamous and senseless massacre of the wives and children of barbarian soldiers, threw thirty thousand veterans into revolt, and opened the road to Rome for Alaric, and the road to Gaul and Spain for Ataulph.* So, too, the rigorous laws against the Donatists in Africa, who boasted four hundred bishops, and several thousand clergy, made the members of that schismatical communion look upon Genseric and his

*Gibbon, Ch. XXXI.

Vandals as deliverers, and materially assisted in the Vandal conquest of Africa.* Once the barriers were broken down, the barbarian irruptions continued, until they had settled themselves over the whole West, and established new kingdoms, which, while nominally a part of the empire, were really independent of it, and of a different faith. These movements affected the imperial city most disastrously; sieges, plunderings, and the loss of the annual tribute of grain from Africa, diminished its wealth and its population; and Rome entered upon its period of material decline just at the time that its bishop was pressing his claim of supremacy most vigorously—a claim which had no meaning for the barbarians of the Arian faith, and which they would take good care should not be practically acknowledged by their Catholic subjects.

It is idle to say, when this was the situation, that the Roman see obtained its credit and its power from the gratitude of the barbarians, whose guidance it took upon itself during this formative period of modern history. The Goths in Italy were not converted from Arianism by Rome, they were exterminated by Justinian; the Goths in Spain were not converted by Rome, they were converted by the native Catholic clergy; the Franks were not converted by Rome. It was not until Augustine was sent to England by Gregory the Great, that Rome began to have any real influence in the new life of the West.

*Gibbon, Ch. XXXIII.

The real power which advanced the credit of the Roman see during these ages was the reaction against the Byzantine despotism over the Eastern Church; and this is the explanation of the fact that although the new map of Europe had been marked out, in outline at least, by the year 500, the Roman see clung to the eastern connection until the first half of the eighth century. I have shown in the previous lecture what the imperial policy was towards the Eastern Church, and what entanglements resulted from it. In the political or diplomatic struggle between the Church and the Emperors, in which the Emperors endeavored to make the Church subservient to the imperial policy, or to adjust the situation to the necessities of the empire, and the Church strove to retain its autonomy as a witness to the faith and a legislator in the affairs of religion, the Bishop of Rome became, so to speak, the constitutional head of the opposition; and the East was willing to exalt his authority, as a counterpoise to that of the Emperor, to any extent short of acknowledging that the primacy implied a supremacy. Against the supremacy it was firm and decided from the beginning; and yet the Bishop of Rome, because of his influence in the affairs of the Eastern Church, was a much more considerable person in the opinion of the East, than he was in that of the West. We may therefore take it as a matter of course, that Rome would continually be making the claim of supremacy, and that the East would quietly ignore it—accepting its

authority and influence, so far as it agreed with the Patriarchal theory of the Eastern Church, and was founded on those ideas of Catholic unity, according to which the concurrence of the five patriarchates was required for the settlement of any affair of ecumenical importance.

For this idea of Catholic unity was the strength of the Church in these eventful times ; and that all the more, because, though the empire was nominally one, it was in practical effect twofold. The five patriarchates covered both empires, and therefore, when the Eastern Church was thrown into disorder by the imperial policy, it was enabled to call in the West to arbitrate between parties, or to throw its weight into the scale, on the ground that Catholic unity must be preserved, not only in the East, but between the East and the West. How favorable this was to the pretensions of the Roman see is evident at a glance ; but at the same time it was a deduction from the true theory of Catholic unity, as realized in the primitive Church. It agreed also with the theory of the imperialist Church of the East, so that it was very easy for the different parties to concur in common action while each was acting under different ideas. There are many times in history, when ideas in this way overlap or interlace, and we cannot understand the course of events unless we give due attention to this fact.

Thus when Innocent I. refused to hold communion with Arsacius, or Atticus of Constantinople during the

life time of St. John Chrysostom, or until his name, after his death, was inserted in the diptychs, he might hold, and his successors might assert that he acted as judge in the appeal of Chrysostom, according to the Sardican canons, or according to the supposed inherent powers of the see of St. Peter. The act would bear that interpretation at Rome. But in the East it would be remembered that such action was according to the ancient custom of the Church, by which all bishops had the right and duty of refusing the communion of those who were in schism or heresy; and therefore that submission to the demands of Innocent was no acknowledgment of his supremacy or appellate jurisdiction, but a recognition of right and justice to the persecuted saint. Or again, when the patriarchal system was fully established, although the inferior bishops had not the same influence they had in the primitive Church, yet, on that theory, what Innocent did was only what any of the patriarchs had full right to do, and what it was his duty to do when circumstances required.

Now it needs to be remembered that in the situation of the Eastern Church, as in the primitive Church, the only way to right a wrong, or to correct an error of any magnitude, was by such action as this to establish a schism, to throw the responsibility of the schism upon the wrong-doer, and then to appeal to the five Patriarchates in General Council assembled, or by other concurrent action, to determine the issue so raised, and

to labor for the restoration of unity by the correction of the wrong. The remedy was heroic, because the Emperor became a party in the case, and there were times when it would have been better not to have applied it—when the wrong would have righted itself had it been let alone; but the issue once raised must be carried through to the end, unless the Eastern Church would be tied, hand and foot, to the Imperial throne. This consideration will enable us to take a different view of the ecclesiastical history of the East from that which has been current since Gibbon set himself to belittle it. It was a battle of giants, not of pigmies. It was not only the contest for the integrity of the faith in Christ against political expediency; but it was the arena of the only political activity allowed to the subjects of a despotic government, because the Church only had reserved rights which the Emperor could not take away; and therefore it manifested oftentimes, with the zeal of the Christian, the passion and violence of a political struggle. The evil was in the system—in the union of Church and State—rather than in the men. And because there were evils to be combated, the strong men, the great men, sought to accumulate power in their hands, that they might combat them successfully. That was true of the ablest and best emperors; it was true also of the ablest and best ecclesiastics. The fact is, that in an abnormal situation, men on both sides are sometimes right when they are wrong, and wrong when they are right. Let us do justice to the motives and

conduct of Marcian, and Leo, and Zeno, and Anastasius, and Heraclius, and Leo the Isaurian ; and let us also do justice to the motives and conduct of Innocent and Celestine, and St. Leo, of Cyril of Alexandria and John of Antioch, of Acacius of Constantinople and Sophronius of Jerusalem, of John of Damascus, and Theodore of the Studium.

All these considerations must enter into the study of this portion of the history of the Eastern Church, and then the true Catholic course of that history may be traced amid all the eddies and counter-currents of the times. Let it be granted, in the case of Nestorius and the Council of Ephesus, that St. Cyril was actuated by a desire to humble the see of Constantinople, which had been exalted above Alexandria, and that he displayed a violent and arbitrary temper at the Council of Ephesus ; still it is true that Nestorianism was a heresy which the Church must repudiate, that it was the duty of St. Cyril to oppose it by breaking off communion with Nestorius, as well as by writing against him ; that it was his duty also, to present the issue to the Church for settlement, and that it was, as a part of that duty, his duty to call the Bishop of Rome to the common adjudication. Let it be granted that Celestine treated the matter as an appeal to himself, upon the new theory that was current at Rome ; still it is true upon Catholic principles, that he had a part in the adjudication, and that the Eastern Church accepted his concurrence, and quietly set aside his assumptions.

In this connection it is important to notice, that although the controversy concerning the reception of the Council of Ephesus was long and bitter in the East, the Bishop of Rome took no particular part in it. His function was discharged when he had assisted at it by the presence of his legates, and concurred in its decrees after they were published. In due time the Eastern Patriarchates also concurred, and the ecumenical character of the Council was determined by that concurrence.

The relation of St. Leo to the Council of Chalcedon further illustrates our position. Eutyches was the favorite of Chrysaphius, the eunuch who had most influence with the weak Emperor Theodosius II., and who is said to have had in mind the deposition of Flavian, the Bishop of Constantinople, and the elevation of Eutyches in his place. The condemnation of the Eutychian heresy, therefore, was mixed up with a miserable court intrigue, in which all the influence and power of the empire was on the side of the heretic. Dioscorus, the Bishop of Alexandria, lent himself to the schemes of Chrysaphius, and was put at the head of a second Council of Ephesus, which had been called on the appeal of Eutyches, with instructions to condemn Nestorianism afresh—that is, of course, the party opposed to Eutyches. St. Leo was invited, upon Catholic principles, to take his part in the determination of the question; but he received the notification as an *appeal*, upon the principles current at Rome. He conducted himself with consummate states-

manship and ability, as well as with thorough honesty; his orthodoxy was unimpeachable, and his celebrated letter to Flavian was worthy to be made a standard of doctrine. The "Robber-Synod" of Ephesus had the temerity to refuse to hear it read, and to try to compel the legates of Leo to assent to the condemnation of Flavian as well as to the restoration of Eutyches. An imperial rescript confirmed this council; but the Church immediately repudiated it, and the cause of Leo, as well as of Flavian, became the cause of orthodoxy against imperialism. Leo demanded a true General Council to be held in Italy, and obtained the concurrence of the Western Emperor in the demand; but just at this juncture Theodosius died, the eunuch Chrysaphius was put to death for his manifold iniquities, and the orthodox Pulcheria called Marcian to the throne of the East as her husband. The General Council was held, but not in Italy; it was convened at Chalcedon; the legates of Leo presided amid the acclamations of those who remembered the proceedings of two years before, and who therefore identified his cause with their own; Dioscorus was condemned for his part in those proceedings; the faith was defined against Eutyches; the letter of Leo to Flavian was read and approved; and the name of Leo was saluted with the appellation of Patriarch.

But although the state of matters just at this time created an enthusiasm in favor of Leo, the Emperor and the Eastern Church were not unmindful of the

Roman pretensions, or incautious enough to acknowledge them. Six years before the Council of Chalcedon, the Western Emperor had granted the decree before mentioned, giving to St. Leo the supreme appellate authority over the West; and in view of that decree (as the Council expressly said in their synodical letter to Leo), the Emperor Marcian proposed, and the Council enacted, those celebrated canons spoken of in the last lecture, which settled the hierarchy of the Eastern Church, and the patriarchal authority of the Bishop of Constantinople. It was of no avail that Leo rejected them, and opposed them with all his might; they are the law of the Eastern Church to this day.

I have already remarked upon the disturbances in the East after the Council of Chalcedon—how the nations and races which were oppressed by the empire, and were not Greek or Latin, adopted Nestorianism or Eutychianism as their badge of discontent, and how Zeno the Emperor and Acacius the Bishop of Constantinople endeavored to allay the dissensions by publishing the *Henoticon*. Acacius was probably the ablest politician who ever occupied the see of Constantinople, and he advanced its pretensions to the greatest height. He held communion with those who accepted the *Henoticon* (which was not unorthodox); among others with Peter Mongus of Alexandria, and he had compromised the legates of Pope Felix III., by inducing them to be present at a service at which the name of Peter was recited in the diptychs. For this

Felix excommunicated him, and declared him to be deposed; whereupon Acacius publicly removed the Pope's name from the diptychs. A schism now began which lasted thirty-five years. It materially increased the troubles of the Emperor Anastasius; it enabled Pope Gelasius, who was a worthy successor of St. Leo, to compare the Pontifical with the Imperial prerogative, and so to advance the Roman claim another step; it consigned Pope Anastasius, Gelasius' successor, to immortal infamy in the pages of Dante, for a disposition to leniency; it gave Pope Symmachus an opportunity to console himself for his subjection to the Gothic King Theodoric, by exalting himself above the Emperor; and it was healed by the Emperor Justin's command to remove the name of Acacius, now deceased, from the diptychs.

Here again, the political explains the ecclesiastical history. The Bishop of Rome at this time was under the barbarian Odoacer, and the Arian Gothic King Theodoric, and it was much to their interest that there should be a schism between the Catholics of the East and of the West. They were nominally vassals of the Emperor at Constantinople; but they had no desire that he should interfere in their affairs; and so long as the schism lasted they were secure on that side—at least Theodoric was. You remember the saying attributed to Ataulph, the founder of the Gothic monarchy in Gaul, that he once aspired, in the confidence of valor and victory, to blot out the name of

Rome ; but when he reflected that laws were necessary to a state, he determined to maintain the Roman Empire. This was the policy of all the more enlightened Goths. They saw that they had not the experience or ability to manage the vast administrative and legal machinery of the empire, and yet that without it, they could not rule their Roman subjects. They continued, therefore, the fiction of the empire, even in their own independent kingdoms, for the sake of the civilization that depended on it, and that which they won by the sword, they were willing to legitimize by the imperial permission to retain. When the last Western Emperor was deposed (A. D. 476) the insignia of sovereignty were sent to Constantinople, with the profession of allegiance to the Emperor there. It was Zeno, the author of the *Henoticon*, who received them. Theodoric obtained Zeno's consent to dispossess Odoacer of Italy, and to hold it as a kingdom dependent on the East. The permission was a mere pretence ; for Theodoric paid no tribute, and the Emperor was unable to demand any ; but it served its purpose to give Theodoric a legitimate title so long as he could hold the country.

But Theodoric knew very well that his title would not hold, if the Emperor felt strong enough to dispossess him, and could count on the loyalty of the Catholics of Italy, and their hatred of an Arian ruler, and therefore, as I said, it was to his interest that there should be a schism between the East and the West. The politics

of the time entered into the internal affairs of the Roman see. The dispute between Symmachus and Laurentius, at the close of the fifth century, was connected with a Byzantine intrigue. When Zeno died and Anastasius ascended the throne (A.D. 491), Theodoric sent Festus, a noble Roman, to Constantinople, to solicit his confirmation as King of Italy. Festus resided at Constantinople some time as Theodoric's ambassador, and while there he entered into some engagement with Anastasius to procure the Bishop of Rome's consent to the *Henoticon*, and so to heal the schism. On the vacancy of the see, therefore, while the people and clergy elected Symmachus, a party of whom Festus was the head set up Laurentius. It was a political quarrel, disguised as a religious one, and was carried on with great acrimony, and not without bloodshed. Theodoric was appealed to ; he decided that the bishop who had the greatest number of suffrages and the prior consecration, should hold the see. The decision was in favor of Symmachus. The party of Laurentius, which included the consul and a large part of the senate, then accused Symmachus of heinous crimes. Theodoric referred the charges to a Council of Italian bishops, whom he summoned to meet in Rome. The Council evaded an inquiry by deciding that the Pope, as such, was free from human censure, leaving the whole to the judgment of God. It provided, however, that the clergy who had taken part against Symmachus should be pardoned on making satisfaction.

Theodoric confirmed the decree, and restored to Symmachus the temporalities of the Church, which had been sequestered pending the inquiry.

It was in connection with these events that Ennodius, Bishop of Pavia, in a treatise defending the Council just mentioned, advanced the proposition that the Bishop of Rome was exempt from all earthly judgment, because he was made holy by the possession of the see of St. Peter. The moral ground of the assertion has been too sadly negatived by the conduct of Popes in later ages; but as a proposition in Canon Law, as canon law was understood at Rome, it had some plausibility. It was a maxim of the same order as "the king can do no wrong." It implied no personal infallibility, no moral innocence; it implied merely that there was no canonical or legal tribunal before which the Pope could be compelled to plead. It put, as Gelasius had done, the Pope on an equality with the Emperor in this respect. By the imperial and ecclesiastical laws, interpreted as they were at Rome, the Bishop of Rome, as the ultimate appellate authority in the Church, had none to whom to appeal, and therefore none to do him justice upon earth. Damasus had once, for a similar reason, asked as a special privilege that he be permitted to plead his cause before the Emperor in person; but fortunately for the Roman see, there was no record that his request had been granted, and it was possible to argue that there was no earthly tribunal to which the Bishop of Rome was amenable. The Sixth General

Council, by the condemnation of Honorius as a Monothelite, supplied the omission; but this was before the time of Honorius. That such an argument as that of Ennodius should be made at Rome was natural. It was unfortunate, however, that it should need to be supported by such documents as the legend of Pope Marcellinus and the Council of Sinuessa, which, Dr. Dollinger informs us, was forged, with other fables of the same sort, at this time and in this connection.

Symmachus, who died in 514, was succeeded by Hormisdas, and in 518 Justin became Emperor in place of Anastasius. He was severely orthodox; the *Henoticon* was repudiated, the eastern sees were placed in the hands of those who had a right to them, the demands of the Bishop of Rome were listened to, and the name of Acacius was removed from the diptychs. The Emperor seemed too desirous to please the Catholics of Italy, and Theodoric took the alarm. He had reason for uneasiness; for within a few years, Clovis, the only orthodox prince of the age, had led his victorious Franks against the Visigoths of Gaul, because "it grieved him that these Arians possessed its fairest provinces." Justin, too, dismissed from the service all heretics but the Gothic mercenaries, whom he was not yet strong enough to proscribe; and there were dark rumors of conspiracies and uprisings in Italy in favor of a restoration of the now Catholic and orthodox empire. Theodoric determined to take the initiative. He disarmed the whole Roman population;

he arrested and put to death several of their principal men; and he sent John, Bishop of Rome, who had succeeded Hormisdas, to Constantinople to demand the same freedom of religion for the Arians in the East, which he had accorded to the Catholics in the West. It was the first time a Bishop of Rome had ever visited Constantinople, and he was received with unbounded honor; but he was probably lukewarm, and certainly unsuccessful in his mission, and on his return Theodoric forgot the argument of Ennodius; he threw John into prison, and kept him there until he died.

Shortly after this Theodoric himself died. His kingdom speedily fell into disorder. Justinian became Emperor, and his terrible general Belisarius was sent to restore the empire in the West. He subdued first the Vandal kingdom in Africa, and then turned his arms against Italy. Theodatus, the Gothic king, sent Agapetus, Bishop of Rome, to Constantinople to avert the storm. Justinian deposed the Bishop of Constantinople at his request, and, as Agapetus died in that city, he celebrated his funeral with great magnificence; but the war went on. In a year Justinian was master of Rome, and in a few years of Italy. The Bishop of Rome was a subject of the Eastern Empire; and the theory of Ennodius was to be put to the test under new conditions, by the behaviour of the nominee of the Empress Theodora, the unhappy Vigilius.

It was a great fall from St. Leo to Vigilius. The moral force of the Roman see deteriorated rapidly amid

the political intrigues and strife of parties, Gothic and Roman, from Symmachus down. It kept pace with the material decay of the city. Vigilius, who had represented Rome at Constantinople, became bishop, it is said, by an intrigue with the Empress, by which he agreed to acknowledge the Eutychians. Silverius was banished to make room for him; Theodora demanded the fulfilment of the contract and he obeyed. But there was no one to mete out to him the measure his predecessors had meted out to Acacius, and he is reckoned among the legitimate Popes. His punishment came in a different way. Justinian was bent upon another of those schemes of concession which seemed so promising and proved so abortive. He had been persuaded that the Monophysites would return to the Church, if certain writings of Theodoret and Ibas of Edessa, and Theodore of Mopsuesta, all of whom were long since dead, were repudiated. Ibas and Theodoret had been admitted to the Council of Chalcedon, and both Monophysites and Catholics understood that to condemn them would be to condemn the Council of Chalcedon; but Justinian was determined to proceed. The traditional policy of the Bishop of Rome was to head the opposition, and Vigilius was disposed to follow it. But he had to deal with Justinian, and he was not St. Leo. He was summoned to Constantinople; he refused to condemn the Three Chapters, as they were called; he excommunicated the patriarch of Constantinople, and the patriarch of Constantinople excommu-

nicated him; in a short time he changed his mind; he was reconciled to the patriarch, and pledged himself to the Emperor to carry out his wishes. By his *Judicatum* he condemned the Three Chapters "without prejudice to the Council of Chalcedon," and the western bishops at once withdrew from his communion. He then revoked his *Judicatum*, and requested the Emperor to summon a Council. The Emperor summoned a Council —the Fifth General—which condemned the Three Chapters, without involving the Council of Chalcedon. It was, as I said in the last lecture, a piece of diplomacy, by which the bishops avoided a rupture with the Emperor. The writings were worthy of censure; but Theodoret and Ibas had purged themselves at the Council, and, as Dupin remarks, the Church was thrown into confusion about a matter of small importance. But our business is with Vigilius. He refused to attend the Council, and fearing violence, he took sanctuary in a church. When the Council condemned the Chapters, he issued a *Constitutum*, censuring the writings, but defending the authors. At length, some six months after, having been exiled to the rock of Proconnesus, he gave in his adhesion to its decrees, and was permitted to return home, but died on the passage.

The behaviour of Vigilius, under the heavy hand of Justinian, like that of Liberius under Constantius, while it enables us to gauge more accurately the vaunted orthodoxy of the bishops of Rome during this period, shows us against what odds the Eastern Church had to

contend for its autonomy and integrity, and cannot fail, amid all the fatiguing study of controversy after controversy, to raise our esteem for that great and much calumniated communion. Three years of the rapacity and corruption of the imperial government in Italy was enough to cure the Italians of their desire for the restoration of the empire ; and when Totila, at the head of only five thousand Goths,* raised the standard of revolt, the cities submitted at his approach ; with a continually increasing army he subdued the country, and laid siege to Rome, which he reduced by famine. It is with a feeling of solemn interest that we read the two or three lines of history which tell us that Totila in his wrath expelled the whole population of the eternal city, and that for forty days Rome lay desolate and forsaken, and without inhabitants.† It was in the year 546. But the Gothic rule had passed away. Belisarius, and after him Narses, restored the supremacy of the empire, and the Goths were literally exterminated. Their place, however, was speedily supplied by the Lombards, who like them were Arians and acknowledged allegiance neither to the Emperor nor to the patriarch of the West. Their frontier line ran between Padua and Ravenna, and between Florence and Rome, and the country they occupied was permanently sundered from the throne of Constantinople. But Rome still continued to be a city

* Two hundred thousand Goths had been slaughtered in the wars with Belisarius.—Gibbon, Ch.

† Gibbon, Ch. XLIII. note 16, referring to Marcel. in Chron. p. 54.

of the Eastern Empire ; it was subject to the exarchs of Ravenna, and its bishops, confirmed by the Emperor, governed without influence and without opportunity, until Gregory the Great discovered the Saxons in England.

The reign of Justinian, within which occurred the five hundredth year from the crucifixion and resurrection of our blessed Lord, seems to me to divide between ancient and mediæval history. In our next lecture we shall be transferred to a new scene and new actors. If the conjecture or calculation of Gibbon be allowed, there was a tremendous clearing of the stage for the next drama that was to be enacted ; for he estimates that in that one reign, not less than a hundred millions of human beings perished by war, by pestilence and by famine. But the continuity of history was not broken. The old world handed over to the new the great facts and principles which were gradually, amid many vicissitudes, to transform the barbarian hordes into the Christian and progressive nations of the modern world. The Empire existed in the East, and was to be revived in the West under Charlemagne and his successors. The Roman law had been reduced to its final form, not only as the instrument for the administration of justice and the ascertaining of rights, but as the text-book of government, in which the imperial power asserted its supremacy in Church and in State, and as the principle of resistance to the Papacy, when the Papal theory had been fully formulated. And the Church, with its Divine

faith, its conscious strength, its compact organization, its moral and spiritual power, was none the less able to deal with the new order, or rather the new disorder of the coming ages, that it had been moulded into a hierarchy which was a variation from its primitive simplicity, and had assumed a form in which we can recognize much that belonged to the imperialist connection, and which is not to be imitated or reproduced among ourselves. It was the Church of Christ as truly in the darkness of the dark ages, as in the light of the nineteenth century.

III.

THE CONVERSION OF THE FRANKS.

III.

THE CONVERSION OF THE FRANKS.

We must now pass over from Italy into Gaul and Germany, and study the history of the Church in its dealings with the new and barbarous races from whom sprang modern Europe. The first thing which I must ask you to remember—and I must ask you to remember it all through this lecture—is, that when we speak of the Church as dealing with barbarous races, we are not to conceive of the members of the Church as one order of beings, and of the barbarous races as another ; as if, for example, we were speaking of the dealings of the people of the United States with the Indian tribes of our frontier ; but that, as time passed on, those barbarous tribes became the Church itself in its human aspect ; they were themselves the laymen and the priests and the bishops of the Church ; they were called to the duties and responsibilities of the Christian profession and the Christian priesthood in their state of barbarism ; and therefore, if Christianity in the times succeeding the overthrow of the empire by the barbarians, seems to wear a barbaric aspect, it is because the Divine grace and the Divine organization are working in and

among the barbarians by means of the barbarians themselves. The period upon which we are now entering is that commonly called the Dark Ages; and I need only refer you to Dr. Maitland's discursive but masterly essays collected into the volume bearing that title, to remind you that there was light in the dark ages; and that the popular notion of them, derived from the time when Mosheim was our text-book of Church History, and Daubigne's Reformation was accepted as authentic and reliable, is wide of the truth, and must, under the influence of the new school of modern history, give way to a better knowledge.

In the year 486 Clovis defeated Syagrius, the last representative of the Roman dominion in Gaul, and founded the kingdom of the Franks. The events which led up to that revolution require a few words.

After the Empire ceased to be aggressive, the defence of the Gallic frontier against the inroads of the German tribes was the care of the Western Emperors. It was their task to maintain the line of the Rhine, as it was that of the Eastern Emperors to maintain the line of the Danube. In this they were successful up to the fifth century. The first serious invasions of the Empire were those of the Goths in Eastern Europe, and it might have appeared that the East, rather than the West, would succumb to the attacks made upon it. But an inspection of the map will show why the Goths did not succeed in overrunning the eastern empire. The East was deeply indented by the sea; its cities

were upon the shores and islands of the Ægean, the Mediterranean and the Adriatic, and on the Bosphorus and the Black Sea, and its maritime commerce could not be destroyed by the barbarians. The Goths were not a seafaring people, nor were they able to reduce the cities which they could not blockade. Though they could make incursions into the interior, and obtain tracts of devastated and abandoned land for settlements, they could not gain the supremacy; they became soldiers of the Empire, not its masters. In the West it was different. Italy was protected in the same way as Macedonia and Thrace, by its seaboard and mountains, and the barbarians did not succeed for a long time in making permanent settlements there, and then only in the northern part. But the wide expanses of open country in Gaul and Spain had not the same natural means of defence against them, and as soon as the legions were withdrawn for the defence of Italy, the barbarians came to stay.

Gibbon dates the fall of the Western Empire from the last day of the year 406. On that day the remains of the vast host of Radagaisus, who had been driven by Stilicho out of Italy with the loss of their leader, made the passage of the Rhine, and poured in a devastating torrent over the Gallic provinces, burning cities and villages, and collecting plunder, until their march was stopped by the ocean. They then turned southward into Spain, where they founded the short-lived kingdoms of the Vandals and the Sueves. Six years after,

the Visigoths made their way into Gaul under Athaulf, and fixed themselves in Aquitaine, west of the Rhone, whence they also passed into Spain. About the same time the Burgundians obtained a settlement in the district to which they have given their name, and the Franks, as auxiliaries of the Empire, in what is now Holland and Belgium. In 475, on the deposition of the last Western Emperor, Odoacer ceded to Euric the Visigoth all the country he possessed between the Alps and the ocean, and in 486, as has been said, Clovis defeated Syagrius. It is with Clovis and the Franks that we have to do in this lecture.

M. Guizot, in his lectures on the history of civilization in France, has pointed out the causes of the weakness of Gaul at the time of the barbarian invasions. It was the same there as everywhere else in the Empire. Despotism at one end of the social scale, and slavery at the other, fiscal oppression, and the jealousy which excluded from the army both the cultivators of the soil and the *curiales* of the city, had destroyed the patriotism and military spirit of the population, and left the country an easy prey to the invaders, when the mercenary legions were withdrawn. There is no doubt that after the first effects of the invasions had passed away, the condition of the common people improved under the barbarians, and that, notwithstanding the horrid tale of crime, of violence and licentiousness, which makes up the history of court and camp for the succeeding centuries, the population, which had fallen

back under imperial oppression, began to increase as soon as that oppression was removed. There was no vitality in the Empire, and the people were content under their new masters.

But if there was no vitality in the Empire, there was immense vitality in the Church of Gaul during this period. In the fifth century, the Gallic Church—the Church of Sts. Pothinus and St. Irenæus, of St. Hilary and St. Prosper, of Sts. Martin and Germanus and Lupus, of Hilary of Arles, and Cæsarius and Remigius —had gathered into itself all the intellectual and moral strength and earnestness which remained in the Gaul of the decaying Empire. Of the ecclesiastical authors of this century, a large proportion, perhaps a majority of those who wrote in Latin, were natives or residents of Gaul, and the subjects they discussed were both theological and practical. The great lights of the age, St. Augustine and St. Jerome, were consulted by Gallic Christians upon the interpretation of Scripture and the doctrines of the Church. The Augustinian doctrine of grace found an able champion in Prosper of Aquitaine. While Salvian of Marseilles was deploring the vices and miseries of the world, and sternly admonishing to a Christian life, Vincent of Lerins was writing his *Commonitorium* against heresy, and expounding the rule of Catholic tradition, *quod semper, ubique, et ab omnibus.* Sidonius Apollinaris, Mamertus Claudienus, and Faustus of Riez were contemporaries, and while the one cultivated literature, and wrote lively letters and

verses, the others discussed the nature of the soul; and Faustus indulged those speculations which produced the Semi-Pelagian controversy. At the beginning of the sixth century flourished Cæsarius of Arles, whose sermons show us what was the kind of preaching at the time—direct, homely, practical, improving. All the remains of the time bear witness to the activity of the Church of Gaul, and to the spiritual life which pervaded it. The Gallican Liturgy was an independent offshoot of the Ephesine family, akin to that which remains as the Mozarabic—a rich and varied service, used by priests and people to edification, and offering the public worship with solemnity and reverence. The Councils of the age maintained discipline and good morals; the bishops and clergy attended zealously to their ecclesiastical duties, and the people followed them with loyal attachment and ready obedience.

To this Church was committed in the Divine order the Christianizing of the Franks. While the bishops of Rome were dealing with the Eastern Church and Empire in pursuit of their scheme of a politico-ecclesiastical supremacy, the Gallican Church was doing its proper work among the people of the Gauls, and it did not cease to do its work among them, when the barbarians became their masters. To understand the difficulty of the work, imagine, if you can, the United States fallen into weakness, possessed of a decaying civilization, and overrun and conquered by the Indian tribes of the great West. Imagine those bands of un-

trained warriors, with their cruel dispositions, their uncontrolled passions, their want of moral self-restraint, first ravaging and burning and plundering, and then exercising the supreme authority over our cities and villages and farms, contemptuous of our weakness, appropriating our wealth, fascinated by our civilization, and tempted to the abuse of our luxury. And then imagine our attempting, in our subjugation, to Christianize them in their possession of irresponsible power. The Franks were not Indians, it is true; they were Germans—and, if Mr. Ruskin is to be believed, a very chivalrous kind of Germans,* but the supposition enables us to understand something of the state of affairs in Gaul at the moment of the conquest, and among the descendants of Clovis after his death. One thing Gaul had, which the United States has not—its religion was concentrated in the one Church, and that Church commanded the respect of the Franks, as our sect-rent and divided Christianity would not, in the case supposed, command the respect of the Indians. It was of the utmost importance for the time then being that this should be so. It was of the utmost importance that the Liturgy should be fixed, that the discipline should be regulated by well-known canons, that the authority of the bishops should be acknowledged, that the necessity of the sacraments for salvation should be appreciated, and that the reverence for sacred persons,

* "Our Fathers have told us." p. 37–'9.

places and things should be—exaggerated if you will. It was a time of transition and revolution, in which both the Roman society and the German society were dissolved, and a new society was to emerge from their elements; and therefore it was a time in which the Church must preserve her vitality and continuity that she might influence the new order that was to be established.

You know the story of the conversion of Clovis—how his wife Clotilda had her children baptized, and pressed him to become a Christian; how at the battle of Tolbiac he called upon the God of Clotilda and won the day; and how he with three thousand of his warriors was baptized by St. Remigius at Rheims. You remember his comment upon the story of the Crucifixion: "Had I been there with my Franks, I would have avenged His wrongs." These words, however justly subject to the criticism which has been freely bestowed upon them, express accurately the first devotion of a warrior band to Christ. It is personal allegiance to the personal Lord, conceived under the ideas of the warrior by calling and profession. It is worship and homage to a real and living King of Heaven. It is the spirit which animated all the German tribes at their conversion;* it flamed out in

* "The *Heliand*," composed among the Saxons after their forcible conversion by Charlemagne, is described as "that deep and glorious song in honor of the Saviour, which introduced into their language—the old Low German or Saxon—the story of the Gospels in a poetical form. This

the knightly chivalry of the Crusades; and it could be perfectly sincere, although associated with very defective ideas of civilized Christian morality. It is very easy to say that the motives of Clovis were a mixture of superstition and policy, and to hint that his conversion was insincere. And it is very easy to say that St. Remigius and his brethren, the bishops of the Gallican Church, with as little sincerity, made their gain of their converts by working upon their superstition and their ignorance. Clovis was superstitious; his conversion, in a wordly point of view, was politic; his conduct after his conversion was crafty and cruel; admit all that—yet his adhesion to the Catholic faith was real, and an event which, in the far-reaching order of Divine Providence, led to the most important results. Little as Christianity seems to have affected his conduct as a ruler, his conversion, like that of Constantine, was an event of great influence upon the future of Christianity in Europe. For the Church of the vanquished to obtain a recognized position of authority over the victors, to be able to claim their allegiance in any way, to bring the moral and spiritual force of religion, however ill-understood, to bear upon their unruly wills, their untamed passions, their untutored intellects, to be an element of control where self-control was

---

memorable monument of a long silent tongue * * presents a picture of Him [Christ] as a rich, mighty, and kind King of the German people, whose followers are faithful unto death."—*Lewis' History of Germany, p.* 87.

wanting, gave it the vantage ground for the effort to make them a Christian people. But the process must be, in the nature of things, tardy and protracted ; and that because, as time went on, these barbarians themselves became, as I said, the Church which was to exercise its influence over them. Never admit, then, that God was not with His Church in the darkest days of Merovingian misrule. Never admit that in the midst of the miseries of the times the Church was not doing His work in ministering His mercy and grace to the souls of men. Is it not strange, when we compare the Goths and the Franks, as Gibbon paints them—the alleged aptitude for civilization of the one, with the asserted barbarism of the other, that the one race should be swept away, and the other give birth to the two mightiest nations of Europe? The one that perished held the Arian heresy ; that which endured confessed the Nicene faith.

Perhaps it is because they confessed the Nicene faith that such hard measure has been dealt out to the Franks by the historians. It is taken for granted that they deteriorated after their so-called conversion. I, myself, do not believe it. We have no such records of their conduct as pagans, as we have in Gregory of Tours of their deeds as Christians ; but we may be sure that incidents, such as those which are narrated of them as so-called Christians, were not foreign to their experience in their pagan state—only that as pagans they were not subjected to the strain of ruling so wide an

empire, nor to the temptations of its luxury. Christianity entering as a leaven into the corporate life of a race works slowly to work surely ; it finds its examples of Christian virtue in individuals here and there, and only gradually draws the mass within its sphere. This is true in the United States to-day, after so many centuries of Christian effort ; it was true also among the Franks. Nor do I believe that the Goths were naturally superior to the Franks in gentleness, justice, aud other Christian virtues. Though they had been longer in contact with civilization, we find them, when occasion called for it, as treacherous and as cruel as the Franks. Theodoric murdered Odoacer at a banquet ; and though he ruled well in Italy while Italy was quiet, yet as soon as he had reason to fear a Catholic uprising, he acted with barbarian promptitude and ruthlessness against his most faithful servants and trusted counsellors. The Goths in Spain, as well as the Vandals in Africa, showed themselves to be possessed of the genuine barbarian temper, by the cruelties practised upon the Catholics. And of the two women who cast such a baleful light upon the third period of the Merovingian history, Fredegonda was a low-born slave, and Brunehaut a high-born Gothic princess.

Then again, much of the disorder and crime of the age was due to the defective political system of the Franks, and to the new circumstances in which they were placed as the rulers of so vast an empire. The kingdom of Clovis and his immediate successors was a

loosely compacted affair, without real organization, or settled principles of government. Strictly speaking, these first Merovingian kings did not govern the country; they were the chiefs of the army that held it. In each city there resided a Count appointed by the king to guard against insurrection; but the Roman population observed their own laws, administered by their own magistrates, of whom the bishop was the chief. The Franks appropriated the country, of which, in the decay of the empire, extensive tracts had gone out of cultivation, and reproduced their own institutions modified by the change in their circumstances. The king differed from the lesser chiefs only by the fact of his birthright and the extent of his possessions. His wealth consisted in his share of the plunder and his ample domains, out of which he supported the royal establishment, visiting one palace or villa after another and consuming the supplies stored up in each. The chiefs appropriated to themselves large estates, cultivated by the conquered rustics as serfs, upon which they resided in rude plenty, surrounded by their retainers, until they were summoned to join the army, or engaged in war with their neighbors on their own account. The freemen tilled their farms, or formed village communities around their chiefs, and held their district assemblies according to Frank custom. An annual muster of the warriors at the field of Mars preserved the unity of the nation, determined on war or peace, and formed such resolves as might pass for

legislation. The army on its march lived upon the country through which it passed, and recompensed itself for the toils of war by the plunder it secured when victorious. It attached itself, therefore, to the successful leader; and though it was uniformly loyal to the royal family, it was indifferent to the individual, and abandoned the weaker without compunction to follow the stronger. Such, in general terms, was the organization of the kingdom under Clovis and his successors. Two results inevitably followed from it; the first was unnecessary and causeless war, the second licentiousness and turbulence in time of peace.

The worst results, however, followed from the application to the monarchy of the Frank law of inheritance, which divided the lands and the wealth of a deceased parent among all his sons. This wrought all manner of confusion. When there were several sons, the kingdom was divided, and then murder or war was resorted to to restore it to unity. Clovis left four sons. Theodoric, the eldest, took the east or German portion of his father's kingdom, with his capital at Metz; he was a warrior like his father, and on one occasion led a hundred thousand men into Italy to make what he could out of the struggle between Narses and the Goths. Chlodomir, the second son, took the south or Roman portion, with his capital at Orleans; Childebert had the west, or Celtic portion, capital, Paris; and Clotaire, the youngest, had the north or Frank portion, capital, Soissons. Chlodomir died first, and Childebert and

Clotaire murdered his children and appropriated his domains. Theodoric died next, and was succeeded by his son Theodebert, and he by his son Theodemir ; but they were all dead in 553, when Clotaire succeeded to their kingdom. Then Childebert died in 558 ; and so the monarchy was reunited in Clotaire. Clotaire died after a year's sole reign, leaving four sons. Sigebert became king at Metz, Chilperic at Soissons, Gontran at Orleans, Charibert at Paris. Charibert died first without male heirs, and his dominions were divided between his brothers. Henceforth we find the great divisions of Austrasia, Neustria and Burgundy ; and there is a struggle for the supremacy between those regions where the Roman population is most numerous, and those in which the German element predominated ; and these conflicting tendencies necessarily led to civil wars. And now began the struggle between Brunehaut and Fredegonda for the mastery. Sigebert of Austrasia married Brunehaut, a Visigothic princess, and the wealth and honor she brought him excited his brother Chilperic of Neustria to ask the hand of her sister Galswintha, for whom he put away his mistress Fredegonda. In a short time Galswintha was murdered, and Chilperic married Fredegonda, to whom the murder was attributed. Brunehaut burned to avenge her sister ; Sigebert drove out Chilperic, and was being elected king of the Neustrian Franks, when he was assassinated by emissaries of Fredegonda. Chilperic recovered Neustria, and Childebert II. succeeded to

Austrasia. On the death of his uncle Gontran he annexed Burgundy. Childebert died in 596, leaving two sons; Theodebert took Austrasia, and Theodoric Burgundy. Brunehaut desired to remain with Theodebert, but the Austrasians, hating her because she was Gothic and Roman, drove her out, and she took refuge with Theodoric in Burgundy. She then, to avenge herself upon the Austrasians, stirred up war between Theodoric and Theodebert; Theodebert was worsted, and Austrasia was annexed to Burgundy. Theodoric died in 613, at the age of 25, leaving four young children, who were set aside, and Clotaire II., the son of Chilperic and Fredegonda, became sole king, at the age of 29, having reigned over the Neustrians since he was two years old. The Austrasians delivered Brunehaut to him, and she was barbarously put to death, and so Fredegonda triumphed.

The peace and prosperity which came to the Franks under the sole and united reigns of Clotaire II. and his son Dagobert show that the vicious law of inheritance of the monarchy was the principal cause of these disorders. There was another reason for the final degeneracy of the Merovingians. The luxury and ceremonial of the monarchy, as the kings at Paris adopted Roman customs, acted unfavorably upon the occupant of the throne, and more unfavorably upon his heirs. Just as the line of a Roman emperor became imbecile and failed by the third or fourth generation, so it was with the Frankish kings. Though the Merovingian line did not

fail until it was set aside, it became imbecile ; because the false dignity that surrounded it cut it off from all practical education, and from the discipline that would produce a robust manhood. Moreover the later kings were feeble boys, beginning to reign in infancy, and therefore necessarily under the tutelage of the mayors of the palace, who kept them in effeminate seclusion, under pretence of preserving their dignity. Allowing for all these facts, we may see reason to mitigate the harsh judgment of history upon the unfortunate Merovingians; and, what is more important, to avoid the error of making them the measure of the virtue or vice of the Franks in general, or of the influence of Christianity among them.*

Still it must be admitted that in dealing with the Franks the Church had a hard task set before it. A nominally Christian, but essentially barbarous nation must be dealt with as a whole, and as individuals as well ; and it was most difficult to induce a proud and high-spirited people to accept laws of morality from their vassals. The Franks lived among the Romans as a military aristocracy ; and although they professed the Christian faith and reverenced the bishops, they thought it a degradation for a Frank to become a clergyman, until the Church came to have political influence. They kept their own laws and customs, and refused to adopt the Roman jurisprudence, or to yield lay obedience to

*One should by all means read Mr. Ruskin's little book, "Our Fathers have told us," for a correction of the usual representation of the Franks.

the canons; and they would not permit the clergy to judge of the justice or injustice of war, or of any affair of State. I have no doubt that a great part of the immorality and cruelty of the time appeared neither immoral nor cruel to the Franks, and that the quarrels in the royal family were thought politically useful by the rude yet shrewd warriors who were satisfied with the results of this "natural selection" and "survival of the fittest," and who willingly transferred their allegiance to the strongest, or to him who survived his relatives. And the Romanized Gallic Churchmen had been schooled in the doctrine of the Empire that it was treason to criticise the policy or conduct of the ruler, and that the head of the State was above all law, so long as he was orthodox in the profession of his faith. So that it was a long time before the Church was able to exert an effective influence upon the morals of the Franks. The clergy exerted themselves, in the meantime, to preserve the property of the Church from spoliation, to secure the right of asylum for the sacred precincts as a mitigation of the horrors of war and a restraint upon private vengeance, to assert the jurisdiction of the bishop over the chaplains in the houses of the chiefs, to put a stop to incestuous marriages (against which there are many canons), and so to drive the entering wedge into the body of corrupt custom which formed the habits of the people, and through their habits, their opinions of what was right and wrong. It was not until a political system began to develop itself, and the bish-

ops were called to a share in the legislation and administration of the kingdom, that they obtained an authority over public morals that was at all respected. And yet there are evidences during the first period of barbarian rule of a real, if late repentance on the part of some of the kings. Sigismund, King of the Burgundians, having in 522, unjustly put his son to death, "afterwards repented of it, and passed many days fasting and weeping at the [church in which was the] tomb of St. Maurice, beseeching God to punish him in this world, and not in the next." And of Clotaire I., of whom we are told by every historian, that he murdered in cold blood the children of his brother Clodomir, we are also told this, which the historians forget to mention, that "in the last year of his reign, he came to [the Church of] St. Martin of Tours, and brought very rich gifts along with him. He there enumerated all the sins of his past life, and with deep groans besought the holy confessor to implore God's mercy for him."* Doubtless it was very superstitious to make large offerings to the Church, and to ask the intercession of the departed saint ; but the repentance that led him to make a public confession of his sins was real, and I doubt not the mercy of God heard his prayers for pardon.

The change in the affairs of Gaul under the Frank dominion had a reactionary effect upon the Church. And here again I must refer you to M. Guizot's discus-

*Fleury, B. XXXIV. Ch. I.

sion of the results of the barbarian invasions, and quote a few sentences: The invasions, he says, "destroyed first, all regular, habitual and easy correspondence between the various parts of the territory; second, all security, all sure prospect of the future; they broke the ties which bound together the inhabitants of the same country, the moments of the same life; they isolated men, and the days of each man. * * * A town was pillaged, a road rendered impassable, a bridge destroyed; such or such a communication ceased; the culture of the land became impossible in such or such a district; in a word, the organic harmony, the general activity of the social body were each day fettered and disturbed. * * * The towns, the primitive elements of the Roman world, survived almost alone amidst its ruin. * * * Even within the towns the ancient society was far from maintaining itself strong and entire; amidst the movements of the invasions the towns were regarded above all as fortresses; the population shut themselves therein to escape from the hordes which ravaged the country. When the barbarian immigration was somewhat diminished, when the new people had planted themselves upon the territory, the towns still remained fortresses; in place of having to defend themselves against the wandering hordes, they had to defend themselves against their neighbors, against the greedy and turbulent possessors of the surrounding country. There was therefore little security behind these weak ramparts. * * * Such in the sixth century were the

general effects of the invasion and establishment of the barbarians upon Roman society ; that was the condition in which they placed it."

This state of affairs seriously affected the Church. It involved a decay in general education, and in the large interests of the world ; it cramped men's thoughts and sympathies into their own narrow and precarious surroundings ; and therefore it involved a decay in theological education and in the wider interests of the world ecclesiastical ; it entangled the bishops and priests of the Church in multiplied local cares, and stifled a generous intellectual development. At the same time it gave an impulse to earnest, practical, personal religion. As the many were pressed with the cares of this world the few were seized with an ardent desire either to mitigate the evils of the time by the unbounded exercise of charity, or to escape from the world altogether to serve God in the seclusion of monasticism. And therefore we find, both in the first and in the second period of the Frank kingdom, that although there was a manifest decline in learning, as compared with the previous age, yet there were a multitude of ecclesiastics who obtained the unbounded love and confidence of the laity for their leadership in zeal and devotion and charity ; and there were many others, both men and women, whose personal purity, and voluntary self-denial, and practice of austerities, which we in our superior enlightenment think unnecessary, if not foolish, were at least an appeal against sensuality, and whose example of volun-

tary submission to hardship for the Kingdom of Heaven's sake, was a great help to the common people in enabling them to bear patiently the miseries of the times. Whatever else may be said of it, the literature of the period, so far as there was a literature, was distinctively Christian—and Christian after a manner which taught those who read it to appreciate and admire, and invited them to practise the charity and purity of the Gospel. And as was the literature, so were the people of whom that literature was the record. The lives of the saints of this age contain many things that are childish, many that are imaginary and imaginative, many that are exaggerated; but they do aim to set forth examples of real goodness, and they appeal to the heart by the sincerity and simplicity that pervade them.

Another change came over the Church of the Franks, as the nation developed a more regular political constitution, and the bishops were recognized as a political power—as the representatives of the Roman or Gallic population. In the year 614, when the Frankish Empire was reunited for the second time, under Clotaire II., the bishops were called to the great assembly of the Franks, and attended to the number of seventy-nine. The event is remarkable as the beginning of the immense political influence which the Church exercised all through the Middle Ages. In that assembly an edict was put forth for the general regulation of the kingdom under the title of the "perpetual constitution." This constitution marks three things: the growth of a

political system among the Franks, founded on written law, the rise of a territorial aristocracy, and the increased importance of the leaders of the Roman population in the national organization. So much is said of the ambition of Churchmen in grasping at political power, that I must ask your attention particularly to their advent into the political arena at this time, and its meaning. They came because they were summoned; and their presence in the national assembly of the Franks means that it was no longer a mere concourse of armed warriors, met to determine upon the next expedition of war and plunder, but a proper legislature for the nation; the chiefs of the Romanized Gauls were called to it as well as the chiefs of the Franks, because all were recognized as parts of the nation. From this time forth, the bishops were, if we may so say, members of parliament, and as a natural consequence they entered into the political life of the age; they were compelled to do it; the times demanded it, and they ought to do it; because the Church only had the education, the knowledge of written law which was necessary for a kingdom in which there was to be a settled administration. It was about this time that the laws of the Franks were reduced to writing, cleared of obsolete pagan customs, and amended by incorporating into them some new provisions inspired with a Christian spirit.

And now, before I go on to consider some bad effects of this calling of the bishops to political influence, I wish to show you some of the men who were bishops

at this time, that you may see for yourselves that in a superstitious and turbulent age they were true Christians; and I do this because neither in the secular histories, nor in the manuals of Church history are the facts given by which you can see their life as it actually was. What I am about to read to you is from an old English translation of several volumes of Fleury which I picked up some time ago; and I give it in the old English, because it is one of the few books I own,* and to which I am able to refer while writing these lectures, and because I like the quaint old style. The first whom I shall introduce to you is St. Arnulph of Metz, the ancestor of Charlemagne.

"St. Arnoul [as Fleury calls him] was of French [*i. e.*, Frank] parentage, of a rich and noble family. Having studied much in his youth, he was placed in the court of King Theodebert, under the direction of Giondulph, mayor of the palace, and acquired so great knowledge in public affairs that he held the first rank next the prince, and alone governed six towns, which used to be governed by six officers, called domestics [*i. e.*, counts]. He was likewise a great soldier; but even at that time he applied himself to prayer, fasting, and to relieve the poor. He married a very noble lady called Doda, by whom he had two sons, Clodulph

* I have also the full edition of Fleury in French, in 25 volumes, 8vo. At Nashotah we had a good library, and I was able to make use of Baronius, Mabillon's Acta Sanctorum Ordinis Benedicti, Labbe's Concilia, &c.

and Ansegisus ;* however, having contracted a great friendship with another lord named Romaric, who was also attached to the service of King Theodebert, they resolved together to renounce the world, and to retire to the monastery of Lerins, but God did not permit them to execute this design. They both entered into the service of King Clotaire (II.). In the first year of his reigning alone in France, the see of Metz had been vacant, * * * and the people with one voice demanding St. Arnoul, he was constrained to accept the bishopric, although he was only a layman. * * * Doda, his wife, retired to Treves and took the monastic veil. St. Arnoul, although a bishop, continued against his inclinations in the court of King Clotaire, where he held the first rank ; but he increased his alms so much that the poor came to him in crowds, even from distant countries." When Clotaire made his son Dagobert, at the age of 15, King of Austrasia, "he sent Arnoul, Bishop of Metz, and Pepin, mayor of the palace, to assist him with their advice, which so long as he followed, he reigned in glory and prosperity."† But when Dagobert succeeded to the sole monarchy, on the death of Clotaire, and removed his residence to Paris, St. Arnulph left the court, resigned his see, and retired to a hermitage in the Vosges, where he died about the year 640. His body was carried to Metz, and buried in the abbey which bears his name.

* From Ansegisus was descended Charlemagne.

† Fleury, B. XXXIII. Ch. 15.

St. Lupus, Archbishop of Sens, was born at Orleans, of parents allied to the royal family. He was made bishop in the year 609. He had supported the party of young Sigebert to the utmost of his power after the death of King Theodoric.* "Afterwards King Clotaire becoming master of Burgundy, sent Farulph thither to take care of his affairs. When he drew near Sens he was very angry that the archbishop did not come out to meet him, and bring him presents; and when he arrived there did not look upon him with a favorable countenance; but St. Lupus said to him, the duty of a bishop is to govern the people, and to teach the great men of the world the commandments of God; and therefore it is rather their duty to come to him." Upon the representations of Farulph, Clotaire "banished St. Lupus to Ausene, a village in Vimen upon the river Bresle, whither he was conducted by a pagan duke named Landegesil. The holy bishop being come thither, and finding profane temples, wherein the people of the country worshipped false gods, believed he was sent by God for their conversion, which was a consolation to him in his banishment. At length, having healed a blind man, he converted Landegesil and baptized him, together with several of the army of the Franks who were yet pagans."† He was subsequently restored to his see, and died in 623.

*That is he had supported the interest of Theodoric's young son Sigebert, as King of Burgundy, against the consolidation of the whole monarchy under Clotaire II.

†Fleury. B. XXXIII. Ch. 15.

The next I wish to tell you of is St. Eligius, of whom Dr. Maitland has so much to say. He was born of Roman [*i. e.*, Gallic] parents, and brought up to the trade of a goldsmith, in which he showed so much skill that he was taken into the service of Clotaire, and made master of the mint. "St. Eloi being come to years of maturity, resolved to clear his conscience, and for this purpose confessing all his actions from his youth to a priest, he inflicted a severe penance upon himself. "This is the first example," says Fleury, "that I find of a general confession." After the death of Clotaire, he grew into so great credit with King Dagobert, that he drew upon himself the envy of wicked men whom he opposed. In the meantime he continued to labor in his calling for the King. * * * St. Eloi had always a book open before him when he worked, that he might at the same time instruct himself in the law of God. There were several books fixed to the walls of his chamber, especially the Holy Scriptures, which he read after he had prayed and sung psalms ; and several of his domestics sung the canonical office with him day and night. * * * Eloi bestowed great sums in alms,* giving to the poor all that he received from the king's bounty. * * * He was more especially

* It ought to be superfluous, but it is not, after what the moderns have said of St. Eligius, to remark that those ancients who speak of the special charity, self-denial or devotion of the saints, assume, as a matter of course, that their readers understand that such persons kept the ten commandments and performed the ordinary duties of religion.

zealous to redeem captives; when he knew that a slave was to be sold in any place, he made haste thither, and sometimes ransomed fifty or a hundred at a time, especially Saxons, who were sold in great companies. * * * On the death of St. Acarius, Bishop of Noyon, St. Eloi was elected to succeed him. * * * When he found he could in no way avoid the Episcopal dignity, he was resolved at least to observe the rules, and would not be consecrated till he had some time practised the clerical duties.† * * * His zeal appeared chiefly in the conversion of the infidels; he carefully visited the cities of his large diocese, especially such as had not yet received the Gospel, as the Flemings, the inhabitants of Antwerp, the Frisons and the Suevi who dwelt near Courtray, and the rest as far as the sea shore, who seemed to be at the extremity of the earth. At first these people were as fierce as wild beasts, and would have pulled him in pieces; but he desired nothing more than martyrdom; at length, considering his goodness, meekness and frugal life, they began to admire, and even to desire to imitate him. Many were converted, the temples were destroyed, and idol-worship abolished. The holy bishop by his discourses raised the minds of these supine and slothful barbarians to an affection for heavenly things, and inspired them with a meek and peaceable temper. Every year at Easter he baptized great numbers,

† That is, he remained some time deacon and priest before being made bishop.

whom he had gained to the knowledge of God in the space of the twelve preceding months. * * * He exhorted such as were already Christians, as well as the new converts, to frequent the churches, give alms, set their slaves at liberty, and to practise all sorts of good works; and persuaded several of both sexes to embrace a monastic life." *

Now of course it was very wrong in St. Eligius to "persuade several of both sexes to embrace a monastic life," but I do think hard measure has been dealt out to him by Mosheim and Gieseler and their copyists, in quoting his sermon as an evidence of the degraded Christianity of the times. After reading what Dr. Maitland gives of that sermon, I think we should be the better to have more such sermons preached to us of the nineteenth century; and, on the whole, my unlearned judgment is, that if ever there was a true Christian upon earth, St. Eligius was one.

The last example I shall bring before you is St. Leger —of whom Dean Milman says, "Legend dwells with fond pertinacity on the holiness of the saint; sterner, but more veracious history cannot but detect the ambitious and turbulent head of a great faction." I have not had the opportunity, of which Dean Milman doubtless availed himself, of reading the life of St. Leger in the Acta Sanctorum of the Bollandists; but I am content to leave your judgment of this censure to rest on what I

*Fleury, B. XXXVII. Ch. 38.

am about to give you from Fleury. St. Leger was Bishop of Autun in Burgundy, at the time that Ebroin was mayor of the palace to Clotaire III. and Theodoric III. of Neustria ; and it is to be remembered that since the "perpetual constitution," the bishops had their political functions as the equals of the secular nobles. St. Leger was opposed to the policy of Ebroin, and acted with the others who were so opposed. On the death of Clotaire III., Ebroin set up Theodoric III., a boy about 15 years old, proposing to rule in his name. St. Leger desired that Childeric II., who had been ten years King of Austrasia, should be elected King of Neustria and Burgundy, and so unite the three kingdoms. I fail to see that he was wrong in exerting himself to bring that about. He did bring it about, and Childeric became king. I need not go through the history ; suffice it to say that after Childeric's death, Ebroin regained power as the minister of Theodoric or Thierry III., and determined to be revenged on St. Leger. And this is what Fleury tells us of the way in which St. Leger acted when Autun was besieged for his sake :

"They marched to Autun in order to apprehend St. Leger, who was there endeavoring to restore his people to their former tranquility, after the disorders which had ensued upon his absence. His friends and his clergy advised him to retire, and to carry with him the treasure which he had, that so the enemy might be diverted from coming thither, when they should have

lost the hopes of getting it into their possession. But he replied, 'To what purpose should I to my shame burden myself with that which I cannot carry with me to heaven? Is it not better to give it to the poor?' Accordingly he caused his silver plate to be brought forth, of which he had a great quantity, and to be beaten in pieces with hammers, that it might be distributed by the hands of trusty persons, all of it but what was dedicated to sacred uses; and it being thus distributed, great relief was thereby afforded to several convents of both sexes. He afterwards ordered a fast of three days, and a general procession, wherein they carried the cross and the relics of the saints about the walls of the city; and at every one of the gates he prostrated himself, and besought God with tears, that if He did call him to martyrdom, He would not suffer his flock to become captives. The people had flocked from all parts, for fear of the enemy, into the city, the gates of which were shut, and every place put into a posture of defence, and the holy bishop called all the people together into the church, and asked pardon of such whom he might chance to have offended, by reprehending them with too much severity. Soon after, the enemy came up, and those within made a stout defence, and continued fighting until the evening. But St. Leger, seeing to what danger they exposed themselves, said: 'Do not fight any longer; if it be upon my account that they are come, I am ready to give them satisfaction: let us send one of our brethren to know what

they would have.' Whereupon an abbot named Meroalde went out to the enemy and applied himself to Diddon; who answered that they would not give over storming the town till they had delivered Leger to them, and taken an oath of fidelity to King Clovis, swearing that King Theodoric was dead. St. Leger, being informed of this answer, publicly declared that he would sooner suffer death than fail in his fidelity to his prince; and the enemy pressing upon the city with fire and sword, he took leave of all the brethren, and, having first received the holy communion, marched boldly towards the gates, which he ordered to be opened, and offered himself to the enemy; who pulled out his eyes, which he endured without suffering his hands to be tied, or venting the least groan, singing psalms all the while." He was subsequently otherwise mutilated, and afterwards put to death.

Now in reading the popular histories, you do not find these facts and such as these brought forward. It is the fashion to represent Christianity as at this time entirely degraded and false to its high mission. You may read of Fredegonda's priests, whom that wicked woman employed to assassinate her enemies; but they do not tell you that the bishops had to struggle hard to exercise jurisdiction over the domestic chaplains of the grandees, and that it frequently happened that these persons would procure the ordination of bad men as chaplains, that they might be free from rebuke for their lawless lives, and that many councils endeavored

to reform this abuse. Nor do they tell you of the saintly lives, of which there are plenty of records, if they would but take notice of them. St. Leger may have been the ambitious and turbulent prelate that Dean Milman represents him; but I confess I sympathize with Mr. Ruskin in his sharp criticism of "the mind that instinctively assumes the desire of place and power not only to be universal in Priesthood, but to be always *purely selfish* in the ground of it. The idea," he adds, "that power might possibly be desired for the sake of its benevolent use, so far as I remember, does not occur in the pages of any ecclesiastical historian of recent date."* I think you will agree with me, that when St. Leger delivered himself up to save his city from assault and pillage, he acted as a good shepherd, "who giveth his life for the sheep," and that his leave-taking, asking their forgiveness, if he had offended any, with prayers and litanies and the holy communion, was both bishop-like and Christian—even if he did carry the cross and the relics in procession about the city; and that he could not have given better evidence of a truly Christian spirit in that particular, had he been as saintly and self-denying and enlightened as Dean Milman himself.

But what I want you to remember just now is, that these men, and such as these were the political bishops of their day; they took part in the political affairs of

* "Our fathers have told us" p. 74.

the kingdom because they were called to do so, and very much to its advantage ; they were the heads and chiefs of the old Roman and Gallic population, and in the unifying of the kingdom that population needed to be represented in the legislative assembly of the Franks. Political power came into their hands because it was to the interest of the nation that it should ; and of course this conferring of political power upon the bishops changed in a great degree their official action and responsibilities. They became statesmen according to the light of the times ; they took part in the affairs of the government ; they were members of the different political and national parties. Robertson remarks, with apparent surprise, that several other saints who are reverenced among the French were opposed to St. Leger and sided with Ebroin. They belonged to the party of Ebroin. But for all this there is no need to asperse their religious character, or to ignore the fact that they were canonized by the public opinion of the people who knew them and reverenced them for the purity, charity and self-denial of their lives.

Here I wish once more to repeat a remark of great importance in the study of ecclesiastical institutions. The history of the Church shows from time to time various corruptions. But those corruptions were not introduced consciously for the sake of making a gain of them. Some of them were "survivals" of previous habits and beliefs among nations imperfectly Chris-

tianized—as we may see in our own negro population at the South at the present day. Or they were exaggerations of a true sentiment, as in the reverence for departed saints, of which I have just spoken—which may be forgiven in a declining age, dwelling with hopeless regret upon departed glories. Or they were inventions of doctrine to excuse or justify abnormal but inveterate practice, as the doctrine of indulgences in its later development, or the doctrine so popular at present, that the Church is made up of jarring sects. Or they were the reaction of the State upon the Church, or of the laity upon the clergy, under the conditions of the times. Or they were the persistence in what were once lawful and laudable adjustments of the variable elements in the organization of the Church, after the circumstances to which they were adjusted had passed away. Now in the period of which I am speaking, we see the origin of a good many things which fall under each of these heads; but what I wish to point out particularly is the origin of some which fall under the last head, and to show you that at this period they were beneficial adjustments, the laudable efforts of good men to cope with the difficulties of the times, that they operated for good, and that they only became "corruptions" by being continued beyond their time. The Bishop of Michigan in a sermon preached some time ago in Cleveland, and subsequently printed, laid down the distinction, which is a very important one, between order and organization; he showed that while the

orders of the Church are three and unchangeable, bishops, priests, and deacons, the Church is able, preserving these orders, to adapt her organization to the circumstances of the times and of the people among whom she labors. In this period of transition, the Gallican Church made this adaptation, and became the Church of the Frankish Empire.

In the later Middle Ages, there was no abuse more flagrant than those which resulted from what is called the "benefit of clergy"—that is, the right which a man who could read had, when put on trial for a crime or misdemeanor, of pleading that the State Court had no jurisdiction over him, because he was a clergyman. And yet, if we look to the origin of that right in this period, we shall see that it sprang from the condition of all law at this time. It is the glory of modern law that it is the "law of the land," and therefore that it administers equal justice to all the inhabitants of the land. Barbarian law, on the other hand, was the law of the tribe. The Salian Frank had one law, the Ripuarian Frank another, the Burgundian another, the Visigoth another, the Romanized Gaul another; and the individual was judged by the law of his tribe or race. Now all these laws were in their origin heathen laws, and although they adopted Christian elements in course of time, yet there was much in them that was not applicable to the circumstances of the clergy and monastic bodies, and many rules necessary for these, that were not applicable to the layman. In the rude

idea of law, therefore, which prevailed, it was the easiest and the best to decide that as the Frank was judged by Frank law, and the Goth by Gothic law, and the Roman by Roman law, so the Churchman should be judged by canon law. Traditions inherited from the Empire favored this claim. Constantius had ordered, as early as 355, that bishops should be tried by bishops, and other emperors gave the bishops jurisdiction over the clergy in minor offences, and in civil causes—their ecclesiastical jurisdiction over their morals and spiritual duties being inherent in their office. As the Roman law was admitted for the Roman population, these exemptions were allowed for the clergy, and they naturally wrought to create a civil and criminal jurisdiction for the clergy, as a class, on the same principles as the law of the tribe. It marks the honesty of those who made this claim, that the penalties in the penitentials were much more severe upon the clergyman than upon the layman for the same offence. Where a layman would have three years' penance, a clerk would have ten years ; and when a deacon would have six, a priest would have ten, and a bishop twelve.

Then again, the right of sanctuary—a right which had belonged to the heathen temples—was naturally conceded to the Christian churches, and served a most useful purpose when the right of private war and personal revenge existed. The very demand to surrender a fugitive would give the Church the opportunity to investigate the matter, to appeal to the conscience of

the wrong-doer and bring him to repentance, to protect the weak, and to preach the gospel of justice and mercy to the pursuer. It was a most important right for the Church to possess in those turbulent times. And so, too, the attempt to secure immunity from the devastations of war for the estates of the Church was in the interests of the people even more than of the clergy. It saved the inhabitants of the devastated lay lands from famine, by enabling the Church to extend charity to them; it restricted the area of war and plunder, and it taught the blessings of peace. And therefore the possession of vast estates by the Church was a good and not an evil in these times. Land was of little value; there was more of it than the population could make use of; vast areas which had been under cultivation fell back into the wilderness; the Church was a good landlord, and under its fostering care the tenants of its estates were enabled to reclaim them and bring them into use, and the revenues derived from the rents paid in kind were used for the support of divine worship, for the charities of life, and for the good of the poor. The time had not yet come for prince-bishops and their luxury, and the holders of these vast estates were the most self-denying of men.

The union of Church and State, however, among the Franks, as in the Empire, produced immense disorders in the Church, and the change in the clergy was great when the Austrasian influence became predominant. The battle of Testry (A. D. 687) gave the Austrasians

under Pepin of Heristal the hegemony of the Franks, and the kingdom became more German than it had been. The Franks were a much larger proportion of the population in Austrasia, than in Neustria, Burgundy or Aquitaine, and the manners and customs were German rather than Roman. It was on this side that the frontier of the kingdom needed to be defended against the heathen tribes beyond the Rhine ; the Austrasians therefore were more warlike, and their chiefs, as leaders in war, and governors of the conquered people, had larger opportunities than those settled in the other divisions of the kingdom, and had become a military aristocracy with vast territorial possessions. It seems to have been in Austrasia that the peculiarly feudal idea developed itself that government and ownership went together, that government implied ownership, and ownership implied government, and therefore that he who was appointed governor of a district was in some way vested with the ownership of the land and people—not exactly as slaves, but as vassals—and must therefore, if possible, make his dominion hereditary in his family. In Neustria, the chief nobles were *Counts*, as companions of the king ; in Austrasia, they took the title of *Dukes*, as leaders of the host. They were more independent of the central authority, and at the same time less disposed to respect the rights of the freemen, whom they gradually reduced to a state of vassalage. Pepin of Heristal, although mayor of the palace to the titular king (who from this time ceased to be of any

importance), was only the first among the Austrasian nobles, and his authority was precarious unless he could keep them employed in national wars, while he was consolidating the kingdom. He therefore convened the national assembly of the Franks with greater regularity than of late ; he employed the arms of those dukes who attended it to reduce those who remained away, and to extend the Frank influence beyond the Rhine ; he himself made his residence at Cologne, rather than at Metz, that he might be more in the midst of the Germans, while he established his authority in Neustria by making his son mayor of the palace of Neustria, and in Burgundy by making another son duke of Burgundy. But the records of his government are too scanty to give a complete view of his policy. It is evident, however, that in his time, and in that of his more celebrated son, Charles Martel, the ecclesiastical interest was quite subordinate to the military, and that an increasing secularity of the clergy was incident to the period. The Church among the Austrasians was more Frank and less Gallic than in the other kingdoms, and therefore more easily fell into the shape of an aristocratic establishment, the benefices of which were appanages of the great families.

For just as soon as the bishops became possessed of political influence by being admitted to the assembly of the *leudes*, two things happened : first, the ruling authority in the State began to treat the estates of the Church as benefices held of the crown, and to take the

appointment of the bishops to itself, notwithstanding the canons providing for free elections ; and secondly, the dignities of the Church began to be an object of desire to those of the Franks who sought wealth and influence, and whose names, it is remarked, begin to appear in the lists of bishops in the seventh century. Bishops therefore were now chosen because of their political connections, and their relation to the aristocracy, rather than for their merit as ecclesiastics ; and these bishops looked upon the wealth of the Church as their own personal property, rather than as a trust for the common good. At the same time the priests of the parochial churches were seldom chosen from the Franks —indeed there were laws against the ordination of those who were liable to military service—but very frequently from the serfs attached to the Church land, or from their children, who were brought up to the service of the Church, and educated in monasteries or in the priests' houses. These clergy were in no condition to assert themselves against the bishops, and they gradually fell to an inferior place ; as the bishops became wealthy and great, the priests became poor and mean. In proportion, too, as the bishops exercised political influence in the national assemblies, where they met their metropolitans on terms of equality, the authority of the metropolitans declined, and the Councils of the Church became less frequent. In the sixth century, fifty-four Councils were held in Gaul, while in the seventh there

were only twenty,* and in the eighth, before Boniface began the reform of the Frankish Church, none. Finally, this class of ecclesiastics introduced into the clerical order the ideas of the Franks in regard to the right to bear arms. This right was the distinctive attribute of the freeman, as the deprivation of it was the mark of the serf; and the member of a noble Frank family would be loth to surrender it, even though it was incompatible with the sacred calling. The disorder of the Church reached its height when Charles Martel was mayor of the palace and real ruler of the Franks. He had been passed over by his father in his dispositions for the future at the approach of death, because of his illegitimacy, and he felt himself for that reason to be under the ban of the Church, and resented it accordingly; and therefore, when he had won his way by his military skill to the leadership, he laid a heavy hand upon the Church's possessions. He treated them as military benefices, and bestowed them upon his captains, who held them as bishops-elect upon receiving the tonsure, but never proceeded to ordination, and performed no episcopal acts and were not really bishops, though they bore the name.† The consequence was that discipline fell entirely into abeyance; for eighty years, it is said, no Councils were held in Austrasia; the so-called bishops led the lives of secular nobles,

* Guizot, II. 269.

† This must be remembered in justice to the Church of that age. Sismondi, p. 191.

and the real bishops were worldly and affected by their associations; the priesthood sank into ignorance and immorality; and the Frankish Church ceased to exert an influence upon the laity favorable to true religion.

But we cannot read the history of God's Church, even in the darkest ages, believing that it is God's Church, and that our blessed Lord is its Head and Life, without tracing the lines of His Providence which run through the tangled web of human affairs. Influences were being prepared at this very time for a reformation of the Church, and for the complicated history of the ages which were to follow; and some of those influences, and they not the least effective for good under the circumstances of succeeding periods, were born of this very condition of the Church. The idea of the national Church was kept alive, and enabled to resist the Papal usurpation through this dependence of the benefices of the Church upon the sovereign, although it was the cause of corruption at this time; and the contest of investitures had its roots thus far back in the past. We speak of the time of Luther and Calvin and Cranmer as the period of the Reformation; but in so speaking we take too narrow a view. The period of the Reformation extends from Charlemagne to the present day, and is not yet completed—perhaps it never will be completed while the Church is in her militant estate. The parables of the tares amid the wheat, and of the net enclosing the good fish and the bad, forbid us to expect the perfect Church on earth. Let it be our consolation that

the imperfect Church somehow does its work ; and that the continually recurring fact of reformation is the evidence of the Church's vitality. A teacher to whom I look with reverence * used to say in my seminary days, that there is no reformation which does not, after a time, need to be reformed ; in other words, that the Church, preserving its divine order and essentials, needs to be adjusted in mutable things to the successive ages through which it lives. View the period from Charlemagne to that which we call the Reformation in this light, and it will not seem the hopeless waste that ordinary Protestantism thinks it. The great movements were attempts at reformation. There was first the Imperialist Reformation—the new Imperialism of Charlemagne. Then, as that failed, as fail it must, there was the Papalist Reformation of Hildebrand. Then there was the attempt to reform by Councils, at Constance, Basle, etc. Then there was the attempt to reform by national and isolated action. And now in this country, God is leading us on our path of reform, separating the Church from the State, giving us to depend on His own institutions of the Apostolic Ministry, the unmutilated Sacraments, and the Faith once delivered to the saints, and enabling us to adapt ourselves to the needs of the new world and the new race which is to inhabit it.

These great movements for reform began with a

* The Rev. William Adams, D.D., of Nashotah.

member of our mother Church of England, the great missionary, Winfred or St. Boniface.

The action and reaction of the several parts of the Church upon each other while Catholic communion is preserved, and the providential ordering of events distant in time and place, as well as close at hand, to assist in need, are among the facts which ecclesiastical history sets before us as evidences of the Divine superintendence, as well as of the Divine institution of the Church Catholic. While the Frankish Church was dealing in its own way with its peculiar problems, and approaching the condition in which it needed the infusion of new blood, so to speak, and help from without, that help was being provided for, and the principles which were to dominate the next age were being formulated under equally peculiar circumstances. I shall have occasion in another lecture to consider the history of the English Church, and need not dwell upon it at present. You all know the story of Gregory the Great and his interest in the Anglo-Saxons, of the mission of Augustine and his monks, the conversion of King Ethelbert, and the founding of the see of Canterbury. I do not think that Ethelbert was quite as ignorant of Christianity as that story supposes, seeing that he had had for twenty-five years a bishop at his court as chaplain to his queen Bertha ; and there is some evidence that he or Bertha sent to Rome requesting missionaries, not wishing to receive them from the neighboring Frank kingdom. But what I want to point out to you now is, that these

Roman missionaries carried to England the views of the Western Patriarchate and the primacy of Rome which were then current at Rome, the development of which we traced in the last lecture. These views had by this time ceased to influence the churches in the new nations of the West. What they were, and their limitations in the time of Gregory the Great, we know very well from Gregory's own words in remonstrating against the assumption of the title Ecumenical Patriarch by John the Faster of Constantinople. Gregory not only did not hold the papalist theory of later times, but he was more humble than some of his predecessors in the assertion of prerogatives which had been previously claimed, and it is evident that the Roman see had suffered in the decay of the city, and its subjection to the Eastern empire. But the views carried to England by the Roman missionaries were the Roman views ; and so it turned out that the newly-converted Anglo-Saxon Church was the most Roman in Western Christendom. It was not Papalist—because Rome itself was not Papalist at this time—that must be distinctly understood ; but it was devoted to Rome out of gratitude for its missionary charity, and it willingly submitted to the Roman primacy. There was another reason also, why in the south of England the Roman ideas should prevail. Conformity to the see of Rome in the observance of Easter and other matters gave the Anglo-Saxons an advantage in their controversies with the ancient British Church, which represented a more ancient type of or-

ganization and usage; and which, therefore, could be faulted as schismatical, because not in accord with the Church universal on those points in regard to which, from its insular and isolated position, it had been cut off from the general movement of Christendom. The English Church, therefore, was led to insist on the Roman connection, and its missionaries being imbued with the principles in which they were educated, advanced the credit of the Roman see in their different fields of labor. The mission of Augustine to England, therefore, was the most important event for Rome in this period; it was the direct cause of the revival of the Western Patriarchate, and of the alliance between Pepin and Charlemagne and the Roman see; and it is satisfactory to the candid mind to know that it was the outgrowth of true Christian zeal, and not of the ambition which is usually attributed to the successors of St. Peter.

St. Boniface (Winfred was his Saxon name) was born in the year 680, when Theodore of Tarsus was Archbishop of Canterbury. Among the benefits conferred by the see of Rome upon the early English Church, not the least was the sending that learned and venerable Greek to be its primate. By his wise exertions, the English Church was united, discipline was regulated, good schools were established, and learning was in a better state than in any other part of Western Christendom.* Not only Latin, but Greek was studied,

* Perhaps I ought to except Ireland. See Stokes, Ireland and the Celtic Church, ch. xi., and remember that John Scotus Erigena was an Irishman.

and England produced some scholars like Bede and Alcuin, who were the foremost of their age. Boniface profited by this movement; he had the best training that could be given at the time; and he had examples to kindle his missionary zeal in men like Willibrord, who devoted their lives to the propagation of the Gospel among the heathen tribes of the continent who were akin to the Saxons. After one or two attempts (he labored for a time with Willibrord) Boniface paid a visit to Rome, and received a commission from Gregory II. (A. D. 718) to preach to the German tribes who were still heathen. In a few years, having been very successful, he was summoned again to Rome and made a "regionary" or missionary bishop. The oath of canonical obedience which he took at his ordination has been made more of in controversial discussion than there is occasion for. It is said to be the first ever required by the Pope of a bishop who was not properly subject to him as metropolitan, and it was made the precedent for requiring the same oath of other bishops; but at the time it had not the significance which was afterwards attached to it. It was the usual oath of canonical obedience taken by a bishop to the Metropolitan ordaining him, with the necessary changes adapting it to a missionary bishop, who would otherwise be autonomous and irresponsible. Returning to Germany, he prosecuted his work with still greater vigor and success, and by 738 he had baptized a hundred thousand converts. Gregory III. gave him the

pall of an archbishop, and authorized him to organize the Church in his missionary field, which he did by founding four Episcopal sees.

By this means there was a German Church east of the Austrasian, free from its traditions, and with a tradition of its own—as, I think, the Austrasian Church had a character different in some respects from that in the older part of Gaul. By that German Church, Boniface was able to act on the Frankish Church for its reformation ; he had imbued it with that reverence for Rome which he had learned in England, and he was able to use the authority of Rome in dealing with the abuses which had reduced the Austrasian Church to such a deplorable condition. On the death of Charles Martel, Pope Zachary made him Vicar Apostolic for the kingdom of the Franks, and he secured the co-operation of Carloman and Pepin, who had succeeded to the power of their father, the one as Mayor of Austrasia, and the other as Mayor of Neustria. In 742 he held a Council, which is said to be the first held in Austrasia for 80 years, and from that time there was an improvement in the Frankish Church. The see of Mentz or Mayence becoming vacant he was made Archbishop and Primate of the German Church. But the missionary spirit was still strong within him ; he resigned his see, and lost his life among the heathen of Frisia.

Now whatever may have been the ideas of the Roman primacy which remained in the Gallic Church from the

time of the Empire and the edict of Valentinian III., there can be no doubt that they were hazy and indefinite, and had no effect upon the Church of the Franks until Boniface reintroduced them and made them practical. Once introduced they bore fruit. Pepin saw in them a means of furthering his political designs. In 747 his brother Carloman, Mayor of Austrasia, retired from active life and became a monk, and Pepin, who had been Mayor of Neustria, ruling in the name of Childeric III., became sole chief of all the Franks. The time had come when the puppets of the Merovingian line might be laid aside; but it must be done prudently. The Austrasians had lost their respect for them, but the Neustrians were still attached to them; and as the political influence of the Church was greater among the Roman population of Neustria than among the Germans of Austrasia, it was desirable that the primate of the whole Church should declare the expediency of the change that was to be made. I have here again to caution you against importing into this transaction the ideas of a later time. Pepin knew well the situation of the Bishop of Rome. The Lombards were pressing hard upon him. The Eastern Empire was unable to defend its Italian provinces against them. Gregory II. had made an effort to organize an Italian Republic by the union of the cities against the invader and had failed. Application had been made to Charles Martel for assistance, but he had been unable or unwilling to make war upon the Lombards. The Bishop of Rome stood

in need of a powerful friend. Pepin was sure of his ground; and the Bishop of Rome's answer to his question in political casuistry would be of authority with the Neustrian and German Churchmen. He therefore sent to Rome the chief ecclesiastics of his palace "to consult Pope Zachary concerning the kings of the Franks, who for a considerable time had borne the name without any authority, viz: Whether it was convenient that affairs should continue in this state? The Pope replied that for the better maintaining of order, it would be best to give the name of king to him who had the power."* The answer was satisfactory; the phantom king was tonsured and consigned to a monastery; Pepin was lifted on the shield according to Frank usage, (A. D., 752,) and anointed and crowned King of the Franks by Archbishop Boniface,† as the Eastern Emperors were anointed and crowned by the Bishop of Constantinople. In two years the Bishop of Rome received his reward. He made a journey into France (Stephen III. in A. D., 754) to solicit aid against the Lombards. He was received with honor; he crowned the king a second time; and Pepin led his

* Fleury, B. XLIII, Ch. 1.

† Robertson doubts that Boniface had anything to do with this affair; others, as Guizot, positively assert that he did. The difficulty that Robertson finds may be explained by the relation of Pepin to the Neustrian Church, where the influence of Boniface was less than in Germany and Austrasia. I think we mistake when we speak of the Frank Church as a whole, and attribute to all what is true of a part. It seems to me that the Neustrian Church was different in character from the Austrasian, and perhaps not in so much disorder.

Franks into Lombardy, and compelled the King of the Lombards to cede to the Pope all the territories of which he had deprived the Empire in late years.*

Pepin died in 768, and was succeeded by his two sons Carloman and Charles. Carloman died in 771, and Charles set aside his young children, and became sole king. The influence of that extraordinary man upon the subsequent history of Europe—of the man whose greatness has been recognized by the unique honor of incorporating the term "the Great" into his very name, "Charlemagne"—will come before us in the next lecture.

*On the forged donation of Constantine, and the forgeries connected with the donation of Pepin, see Dollinger, Fables of the Popes.

IV.

THE NEW IMPERIALISM.

IV.

THE NEW IMPERIALISM.

Charlemagne was, take him all in all, incomparably the greatest man that Europe has seen since the years were counted by the Christian era. Not only by his wonderful physical activity, his tremendous energy in war, his extension of the area of the Frankish dominion, his making himself Emperor ; but by his administrative ability, his intellectual vigor, his untiring efforts to elevate and benefit his people, his unceasing attention to all details of government, his success in securing the obedience of his subjects, his sense of the value of education and learning and his endeavors to promote them, his determination to reform the Church, and his authority over the hierarchy, including the Bishop of Rome himself—by the rightness of his aims, the conscientiousness of his efforts, and the real religiousness of his spirit, as well as the grandeur of his personality, and the immensity of his capacity for work, he merits the title bestowed upon him, without any abatement for the age in which he lived, or the people over whom he ruled. I know, of course, the blots upon his fame. He unceremoniously set aside the children of his brother ; he put

to death four thousand five hundred Saxon prisoners in cold blood; his matrimonial relations were those of a Frank king. But no man is perfect. The probability is that his age and his people were with him in all these matters. Charlemagne was a born ruler of men. Government was as much an instinct to him as poetry with Shakespeare. He held the ascendancy over other men by the greatness of his genius, the genuineness of his moral nature, the strength of his purpose, and the sincerity of his efforts to give order to the body politic. He was too great to be selfish, too great to be jealous, and men obeyed him spontaneously, and loved him not a little. The parallel has been drawn between him and David the great King of Israel, and it would seem that he himself was conscious of the resemblance, and took David for his model. He had strong affections as well as a stern will, a shrewd practical insight as well as great ideas, he could manage an empire as well as a farm, and attend to the details of a farm in the midst of the cares of an empire. A German of the Germans, a Frank through and through, he governed his people through their own institutions without jealousy, and converted them into the institutions of the Empire without revolution. He called his bishops and nobles and freemen to the National Assembly twice a year, in May and August, and in their presence and with their counsel, he surveyed the state of his vast dominions, determined what legislation was needed for Church and State, and what warlike expedition was necessary to

keep the enemies of the Empire in check, or to reduce the rebellious. His wars with the heathen Saxons on the north, the Huns and Avars on the east, the Lombards in Italy, and the Saracens in Spain, though aggressive in their conduct, were defensive in purpose, and his fifty-three campaigns, ruthlessly as they were carried on, were in the interest of order against lawlessness, of civilization against barbarism, of Christianity against heathenism and Mohammedanism. In the work of administration and government he was equally untiring. When we turn to the vast collection of his capitularies, and note the multitude of matters to which he gave personal attention, the wonder is, that a man who seems to have spent his whole life in war could do more than a life's work in endeavoring to reform and advance his people. He evidently had no cut and dried theory; but he obeyed the mandate of Scripture: "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might." He set himself to strengthen the existing institutions in Church and State; he was urgent in requiring that schools should be opened in every parish, where the children of the poor, as well as those of the rich, could learn what there was to learn at the time; he established a school in the palace as a model, in which he was himself a scholar, and he took into his service the learned men whom he could find and induce to come to him, that they might advance learning in his dominions. He sent his *missi dominici* (the originals of our Circuit Courts and Circuit Judges) upon

regular circuits to inspect the conduct of his officers, and to administer justice in his name; and when he took to himself the title and state of Emperor, I have no doubt whatever that his object was less personal ambition than the good of his people. What was wanted in that turbulent age was a central authority strong enough to keep in order the military aristocracy, and to blend into one the various nationalities over which the rule of the Franks extended, and that central authority Charlemagne thought he found in the imperial prerogative.

The influence of Charlemagne upon Christendom and the Church is our present inquiry. The first and greatest element of that influence was his assumption of the Empire. It was supposed to be the "Holy Roman Empire," but it was in reality the German Empire; for though it suffered eclipse in the age succeeding Charlemagne, the idea did not die; it took root and revived, and was, with the Papacy, the chief factor in the history of the Middle Ages. I speak of Charlemagne's assumption of the Empire, and I do so advisedly. It is true that Pope Leo surprised him on that memorable Christmas Day of the year 800, by suddenly placing upon his head during Divine Service the imperial crown, and that Charles afterwards expressed his disapproval of the act. There is no reason for accusing him of dissimulation or collusion in so doing; but unless he had had the idea of making himself Emperor, he would not have been forced into it by the unauthorized act of the

Roman pontiff. My own opinion is that Charles was really offended at the Bishop of Rome's intermeddling, and that for the very reason that he intended the Empire to come to him in a different way.* There is evidence that his intimates expected him to become emperor at this time (Alcuin's Bible is well-known), to show that it was in his mind; and it is of great significance that when he associated his son Louis with himself, as he felt age and infirmity growing upon him, he made Louis take the crown himself from the altar, and put it upon his own head. That act shows Charlemagne's idea of the imperial authority, and his determination that it should not vest in the Roman pontiff to bestow it. It seems as if he had a prescience of claims that were afterwards to be set up, and was resolved to guard against them.

The time was propitious, and the motives sufficient for the assumption of the title. In the long line of succession of the emperors of the East—those sovereigns whose dignity had been up to this time unapproachable—there had been no real break since

* See the chapter on "The Empire and Policy of Charles" in Bryce's "Holy Roman Empire." In the discussion (pp. 58–60) of the question "Was the coronation a surprise?" Mr. Bryce overlooks the fact that Charles had reason to be suspicious of the Pope, since he had been imposed upon by forged documents in relation to the donation of Pepin. See Dollinger's Fables of the Popes. Nor does he seem to see the significance of Charlemagne's action in making his son Louis *crown himself* when he makes him his successor.

Constantine until now; and now there was a break. Just at this moment the sceptre was in the hands of a woman—that Irene whose crimes towards her son have been offset, in the minds of eastern monks and Romish historians, by her devotion to image worship. To a Frank, an Empress was no sovereign, and there was no Emperor. Charles took the dignity, because it was vacant for him, and he had the right to it; because he was master of the City from which the title and authority originated. It is probable that he thought to unite the East and the West, and so to restore the imperial authority over the whole of Christendom; for he negotiated or pretended to negotiate a marriage with Irene; but that was not to be, and in a short time Irene was dethroned, and Nicephorus was reigning at Constantinople. As regards the West there was motive enough in the situation. Charlemagne ruled over many peoples, each with its own customs, and he needed an authority which would enable him to reform those customs as occasion required. The imperial authority was well defined by the Roman traditions and Roman law, and the Emperor was not subject to the limitations of the King of the Franks; particularly he was the unquestioned superior of the Bishop of Rome, and through him of all the ecclesiastical hierarchy. But there was a still further reason. By introducing into the Frank polity an office and a title which were not subject to the Frank traditions, there was given, so it might seem, the means of averting the disorders which

in the past had followed the partition of the kingdom, according to the Frank law of inheritance, among the sons of a deceased king. That law of inheritance had been at the root of the civil wars which disgraced their history; and it was necessary that there should be an escape from it, if the government was to be stable and enduring. The right of primogeniture was not yet thought of; it was a later invention belonging to Feudalism. The traditions of the Empire seemed to offer the safeguard needed, and the possession of Italy and Rome authorized the assumption of the imperial title.

In passing over to the Germans, under such a man as Charlemagne, the Empire necessarily changed its character. The German institutions easily lent themselves to it. The annual assembly became a court and a legislative body such as the Eastern Emperors lacked; the governors who ruled their dukedoms and lordships were required to be present at it to give an account of their governments; they came to do homage and render obedience, as well as to assist in making the capitularies; the chief ecclesiastics were there to report upon the state of the Church, and to advise the enactment of canons or laws for its regulation; all orders in the State had the right to be present and to take part, each in its place; the Emperor was not jealous of his subordinates; high as they might be, he was higher. The imperial title therefore, furnished, or seemed able to furnish the means by which the division of the

kingdom into kingdoms might consist with the unity of the whole. The Emperor made his three sons kings, but he was their superior as Emperor, and he may have thought that such would be the order for time to come. In this new phase—and the idea passed into the Middle Ages—the Emperor was "king of kings and lord of lords," and being so he looked upon himself as the "vicar of Christ,"* in as full a sense as the Roman bishop thought himself to be in later times.†

* "The Emperor Joseph II., at the end of the eighteenth century was 'Advocate of the Christian Church,' 'VICAR OF CHRIST,' 'Imperial Head of the Faithful,' 'Leader of the Christian Army,' 'Protector of Palestine,' of general councils, of the Catholic faith."—Bryce, *Holy Roman Empire, p.* 202. The Bishop of Rome, in the time of Charlemagne and for ages after, arrogated to himself no higher title than that of "Vicar of St. Peter."

† The idea was worked out for the temporal ruler in the Spanish Church, by Isidore of Seville, early in the seventh century. In the acts of the Council of Aix, held by Louis the Pious, in 816, there is a long quotation from Isidore, in which the parallel between the Christian ministry and that of the Old Testament dispensation is drawn. It contains the following passage and more of the same sort: "Sed forsitan quæritur et hoc: cujus figuram faciebat Moses? Si enim filii Aaron presbyterorum figuram faciebant, et Aaron summi sacerdotis, id est Episcopi; Moses cujus? Indubitanter Christi, et vere per omnia Christi; quoniam fuit Similitudo Mediatoris Dei, qui est inter Deum et hominem Jesus Christus, qui est verus *Dux populorum, verus Princeps Sacerdotum, et Dominus Pontificum*, cui est honor et gloria in sæcula sæculorum. Amen." The calling our Saviour, Duke, Prince and Lord, would necessarily imply what is said in the text. The following is from the same passage: "In novo antem testamento post Christum sacerdotalis ordo a Petro cœpit. Ipsi enim primum datus est Pontificatus in Ecclesia Christi. * * * Siquidem et cœteri Apostoli cum Petro par consortium honoris et potestatis acceperunt. Qui etiam in toto orbe dispersi Evangelium prædicaverunt; quibusque decedentibus successerunt Episcopi, qui sunt constituti per totum mundum in sedibus Apostolorum." *Concilia Germanica*, Vol. I., p. 439. I have studied only those capitularies of Charlemagne and Louis which are in the Concilia Germanica.

Now this explains the relation of Charlemagne to the Bishop of Rome. It has been much disputed what was the nature of his donations of territory to the Roman see—whether they were absolute or merely in usufruct—whether the Bishop of Rome received them as sovereign, or merely as proprietor. The answer is that in that and subsequent ages proprietorship and government were identical; proprietorship implied government and government implied proprietorship; but that, except in the case of the supreme ruler himself, neither the lordship nor the proprietorship was absolute, but always dependent upon the sovereign. The Bishop of Rome held of the Emperor in the same way as the possessors of fiefs held of their lords under the feudal system when that was in operation; he was both ruler and subject, as regards his temporal dominions, just as all other lords of the empire were, spiritual and temporal. The weakness as well as the strength of the empire consisted in this confusion of ownership with government. The division of functions which Constantine introduced into the Roman administration, and which modern governments find it to their advantage to provide for, was too complex a notion for the times. A man was put in place over a lordship, and was responsible for all under him—that was the simple idea. The lord was owner of the land, as well as governor of the people; but he was both owner and governor in subordination to the Emperor; and therefore on the one hand when he was deprived of his government, he

was deprived also of his estate; and, on the other hand, it was his interest when made duke or count, to strengthen himself in possession, and to make his dukedom or county hereditary in his family. The weakness was that, when he became powerful enough to rebel, the central authority had no check upon him except by raising up against him his compeers, who might, if they also were discontented, make common cause with him. This was the cause of the disorders in the Empire under the descendants of Charlemagne. But while the great Emperor lived, the danger was not apparent. He was strong enough to compel obedience and to count on loyalty, and therefore he neither saw the danger nor cared to make the nice distinctions by which it was to be avoided. In the same way the ecclesiastical powers became lords and temporal governors over the inhabitants of their estates. It was the general rule, with this advantage in favor of the Church, that no questions of forfeiture or hereditary right came in to complicate the relation. The bishop or abbot, being a celibate, could have no legal offspring to take his lordship, and therefore it descended without question to the next incumbent; in all other respects he was not only an ecclesiastical dignitary, but a temporal lord as well. The Bishop of Rome under Charlemagne and his successors, although he was respected as primate of the whole Church, and endowed with larger possessions than the others, was in precisely the same relation to the Emperor as all other governors,

lay or ecclesiastical. He was both lord and subject. He was lord of the Roman dominion, but subject of the Emperor—chief bishop of the Church, but subject to the imperial confirmation and visitation. In one respect, Charles distinctly set aside the Roman bishop's claim to jurisdiction. In publishing the ancient canons for the information of the Frankish Church, he erased the canons of Sardica, and made himself the court of appeal of last resort.

In establishing this relation, Charles introduced the new imperialism into Western Europe, as his contribution to the solution of the questions involved in the union of Church and State. It cannot be said that he invented any new thing; the Pope had been a subject of the Eastern Emperor, he now became a subject of the Western Emperor. But it is the peculiar characteristic of Charlemagne's influence upon his times, that without originating any new principles, he gave a new character to the traditional institutions by the force of his own personality. It was assuredly no new idea, that the monarch was to be head of both Church and State; but it took a new form after Charlemagne; it worked differently in the West from what it did in the East; and the reason is that it was incorporated into the western imperial system, in connection with the institutions of the German race. The prelates of the Church having temporal as well as spiritual rule, became the political equals of the military aristocracy, and were able in some degree to hold them in check.

The sovereign being accustomed to take counsel with his people in the great national assembly, met there, in the ecclesiastics, a class of men who looked at matters from a different point of view from the mere laymen, who brought Christian principles to bear upon the discussion of affairs of State; and thus there was a compensation in some degree for the secularizing influence of the situation upon the clergy themselves. The Church was undoubtedly strengthened by this reform. It held together through all the troublous times of Charlemagne's descendants. It made great mistakes and suffered for them; but the particular disorders of the time of Charles Martel did not reappear. The change is seen in the great statesmen-prelates of the subsequent ages such as Hincmar, in the pomp and splendor which attended Divine service in the Mediæval Church, in the personal grandeur and princely surroundings of the hierarchy as lords spiritual of the Christian Empire, in the more compact organization and moral elevation of the priesthood through the enforcement of the rules of the canonical life, and in the attempt to deal with the laity through the penitential discipline, in the form given to it by Theodore of Canterbury. The rude barons who tore the empire to pieces, came in contact with men as powerful as themselves, who were able to oppose an intellectual supremacy to their brute force, to awe them by their spiritual authority, to teach them, in some degree at least, needed lessons of

humanity, and in some cases at least, to bring them to a true repentance.

And if, in consequence of their political importance there was among the higher clergy, in the ages succeeding, something too much of secular feeling, there was in another direction some compensation for this. The Mediæval Church was a very complex and highly organized body, in which there were many members, none of which could say to the other, "I have no need of you." In our modern Church in which, by the simple expedient of shutting out from religion all the secular business of life, we have brought everything down to a dead level, and get along with priests whose duty it is to write two sermons a week, and bishops whose business is to travel from village to village to confirm, we cannot comprehend the grandeur and completeness of the idea of the Christian commonwealth which was both Church and State, as it must have presented itself to a mind like that of Charlemagne, who felt himself in his imperial office to be the vicegerent of Christ the King, who therefore endeavored to make all his institutions Christian, who did not fear to call his clergy, as well as his laity, to the work of government and administration, and to whom the work of every man in his calling, whether ploughman, soldier or priest, was sacred and Christian.* In such a Church and State, the

* "In a great assembly held at Aachen, A.D. 802, the lately crowned Emperor revised the laws of all the races that obeyed him, endeavoring to harmonize and correct them, and issued a capitulary singular in sub-

action and interaction of influences flowed in channels with which we are not familiar, and produced results which we do not appreciate. In this way the monastic institutions were the corrective of the secularizing tendency to which their political responsibilities exposed the clergy. They were the home of a real spiritual life which diffused itself over the whole Church. Monasticism had been reformed by St. Benedict of Nursia, a long time before, and his rule made it a life of practical benefit to the monk himself, and to the community at large. The obligation to work as well as to pray was of incalculable advantage in the rude ages we

ject and tone. All persons within his dominions, as well ecclesiastical as civil, who have already sworn allegiance to him as king, are thereby commanded to swear to him afresh as Cæsar ; and all who have never yet sworn, down to the age of twelve, shall now take the same oath. 'At the same time it shall be publicly explained to all what is the force and meaning of this oath, and how much more it includes than a mere promise of fidelity to the monarch's person. Firstly, it binds those who swear it to live, each and every one of them, according to his strength and knowledge, in the holy service of God ; since the Lord Emperor cannot extend over all his care and discipline. Secondly, it binds them neither by force nor fraud to seize or molest any of the goods or servants of his crown. Thirdly, to do no violence nor treason towards the holy Church or to widows, or orphans or strangers, seeing that the Lord Emperor has been appointed after the Lord and His Saints, the protector and defender of all such.' Then in similar fashion purity of life is prescribed to the monks ; homicide, the neglect of hospitality and other offences are denounced, the notions of sin and crime being intermingled and almost identified in a way to which no parallel can be found, unless it be in the Mosaic Code. There God, the invisible object of worship, is also, though almost incidentally, the judge and political ruler of Israel ; here the whole cycle of social and moral duty is deduced from the obligation of obedience to the visible autocratic head of the Christian State."—*Bryce, Holy Roman Empire*, pp. 65–6.

are dealing with. It made agriculture honorable, and assisted in reclaiming vast tracts of land from the desert into which they had relapsed. The monks planting themselves in the recesses of the forests, by a flowing brook, began clearing the land, and in a short time " the wilderness and the solitary place were made glad for them," a village would grow up around the monastery, and a new centre of civilization was established. As the monastic estates became valuable, some laxity and disorder crept in under the mayors of the palace ; but Charlemagne endeavored to correct them, and within a few years after his death a comprehensive reform was undertaken by Benedict of Aniane under authority from Louis the Pious. In the troublous times that followed, the monasteries offered a retreat from the world to such as desired to forsake it, an opportunity for a life of devotion and worship to those who longed for it, a seclusion for repentance to the burdened conscience, an example to the outside world of self-denial for Christ's sake, and last, but not least, a quiet corner for study and meditation for those who desired to advance in the learning that the age possessed. It was found that the obligation to work was met, not only by manual labor, but by the cultivation of the useful and fine arts (such as they were), by the multiplication of books, and the devotion to study. The impulse given by Charlemagne to education bore its most abundant fruit in the monasteries. He required that each parish priest should teach the children

of his parish, and that each Cathedral should sustain a school of higher learning; but it was naturally in the monasteries that study would be taken up as a life-work, and followed with a real love for it for its own sake, and doubtless there were in the cloisters of Western Europe, many guileless souls, who like the Venerable Bede were happy with their books, and useful to their age as students and teachers and copyists of manuscripts, almost all of which were written in the monastic *Scriptoria*. In such ways as these, as well as by calling eminent monks to the high places of the Church, an influence spread from the monasteries over the whole Church, keeping up the spiritual and intellectual life, not only of the monks, but also of the priests and people.

The capitularies of Charlemagne contained many admonitions to the monks to observe the "regular" and to the clergy to observe the "canonical" life. The term "canonical life" may apply to that obedience to the canons in general which was incumbent upon the clergy; but it also contemplated the extension to the clergy of a semi-monastic rule instituted about 760 by Chrodegang, Bishop of Metz. This rule was made for the clergy of Cathedral and collegiate chapters, and was the origin of the mediæval development of those bodies. Where a church had numerous clergy, they were assembled in a common home with cloisters like a monastery, and subjected to a rule which differed from the monastic rule by certain more free regulations suitable to the calling and duties of the clergy—among

others in allowing absence from the cloister for the performance of Divine service in the country churches, in the permission to retain private property, and in making certain distinctions in the distribution of the stipends. The clergy of Cathedrals came to be called canons by reason of their obligation to this rule, which was speedily adopted by other bishops, and was made general by Louis the Pious in his capitulary of Aix. The advantages of the brotherhood idea for a body of men who were pledged to celibacy were manifest, and the improvement in their moral and religious condition resulting from it raised their credit with the people, and contributed to increase the influence they exercised and the respect in which they were held. Whether Charlemagne's substitution of the Roman Liturgy for the Gallican was an improvement or not may be questioned ; it is at least matter for regret that because of it the Gallican Liturgy has perished. Perhaps it had become too complicated and the copies of it were in a bad state, and it probably appeared to the Emperor that one Liturgy for all his dominions was the best. At any rate, by the means mentioned, and by attention to details in other directions, without any extensive theoretical innovations, the institutions of the Church were strengthened immensely under Charlemagne and his influence was felt throughout the whole mediæval period.

And now, for a more personal interest in Charlemagne himself, I wish to read you, again from my old copy

of Fleury, the account of the closing scenes of his life:

"Louis being arrived at Aix-la-Chapelle, the Emperor his father convened a great assembly of the bishops, abbots, dukes, counts and all the French [Franks]. He exhorted them to be faithful to his son, and demanded whether they were willing that he should give him the title of Emperor. They answered, this was a thought inspired of God. On the Sunday following, Charles in his royal robes, with the crown on his head, walked to the church, and advancing to the high altar, caused another crown to be placed thereon. And after he and his son had prayed for a long time, he spoke to him in presence of the whole assembly of prelates and lords; admonishing him in the first place to love and fear God and to keep all His commandments, to protect the churches, to be affectionate and kind to his sisters and young brothers, to be loving to his nephews and all his relations. 'Honor,' added he, 'the bishops as your fathers; love the people as your children; make choice of faithful and upright officers, such as fear God, and do not displace them without cause; and show yourself always blameless before God and man.' Charles gave his son much more advice, and asked him if he was resolved to obey his counsel. Louis replied that with the help of God he would obey it with all his heart. Then Charles bid him take the crown from off the altar with his own hands, and place it on his head, giving him to understand thereby, that he had his empire only from God. Louis put the crown on his head, and the people

shouted, crying 'Long live the Emperor Louis!' and solemnized the day with great rejoicings. Charles returned thanks to God, saying with David, 'Blessed be Thou, O Lord, who hast set my son on my throne this day, mine eyes even seeing it.' * * * The Emperor Charles continued at Aix-la-Chapelle, spending his time in devotion, almsgiving, and amendment of the sacred writings. For he employed the latter part of his life in correcting the texts of the four Gospels, taking great pains therein, with the assistance of Greeks and Syrians. He showed all his life long a fervent zeal for religion and a sincere piety; he never failed, when his health would permit, to frequent the church morning and evening, and to assist at the Nocturns and the Mass; at which he took care that the whole service should be performed with all possible decency, and often gave directions to the overseers of the church not to suffer any disorder in this respect. * * * In January 814 [he] was taken with a fever at his coming out of the bath. He thought to be cured by his usual measure of abstinence, taking no nourishment but a little water; but being seized with a pleurisy at the same time, on the seventh day of his sickness he sent for the Archbishop Hildebald, his chief chaplain, who in company with other bishops, gave him the extreme unction, and the viaticum, that is, the Body and Blood of our Lord; and two days after, finding himself ready to expire, he made the sign of the cross upon his forehead, his breast, and all over his body; and died repeating, 'Into Thy hands O Lord, I

commend my spirit.' He was buried the same day, which was the 28th of January, 814, being seventy-two years of age, whereof he had reigned forty-five as King of France [i. e. of the Franks], and thirteen as Emperor." *

Louis the Pious was made co-emperor, as we have seen, in 813. On the death of his father he came into full possession of the supreme dignity. The histories usually read, represent him as a weak prince, because of whose imbecility the Empire went to pieces. They unite also in representing his successors as more imbecile than himself, and attribute the calamities of the age that followed to their incapacity. One great historian, however, Sir Francis Palgrave, dissents from this verdict; he affirms that the race of Charlemagne to the last displayed an ability equal or superior to that of the average public men of their time, and finds in moral causes the explanation of that catastrophe. Others, as Sir James Stephen in his lectures on the history of France, return the brief and compendious answer, "Barbarism" to the question, Why did not the Empire of Charlemagne endure? This answer is a true one as far as it goes; but it is not a complete answer. Many causes co-operated, some retrogressive, others progressive, and the study of them merits more attention than is usually given to it. The defects of the system of government were grave, the relation of the Church to

* Fleury, B. 46, Ch. 7, 8.

the State was unsatisfactory to some influential parties, the successors of Charlemagne, though not imbecile, were unequal to their task, the nobles were selfish and turbulent, the people were politically weak, the age was one of transition, and the divergent tendencies of the Romance and German elements compelled a division into the nations of modern Europe. But one of the chief causes of the disruption of the Empire was the attempt of the clergy to acquire a preponderance in the direction of civil affairs, and so to go beyond their province—an attempt which reacted with terrible effect upon the Church itself, and for which it suffered in the order of Providence a severe punishment.

The Empire would work smoothly as long as it had for its head a man of the genius and power of Charlemagne; but no provision had been made for the contingency of a weaker ruler. I have pointed out how the administrative system of Constantine sustained the government of the East under a feeble Emperor by the division of responsibility among subordinates. No such expedient was known to the Franks or thought of by Charlemagne. As long as he was at the head it was unnecessary; but as soon as he was taken away, the defect became apparent. A strong central authority was necessary to keep the turbulent element in order, and that central authority must be either a man of surpassing greatness or a corporation of officials interested in the integrity of the government, when the nominal head of it is weak. The days of mayors of the palace

were past, the feudal age had not begun, the administrative system of the East was incompatible with the time and place, and the expectation that each person would be good enough to do his duty in that state to which God had called him, was a poor foundation on which to construct the fabric of an earthly government. Under these circumstances it was the duty of the Church, having acquired during the previous age a political status, to strengthen the imperial authority by a conscientious and enlightened loyalty; and it was because it failed in this, that it fell into the disorder of the tenth century.

Louis had been made King of Aquitaine by his father when he was but five years old, and had been sent into that region to grow up among his people under the tutorship of William Curt-nez,* Count of Toulouse, or Duke of Septimania, a devout man who, after distinguishing himself both in war and in the government of his country, became a monk, and was reverenced as a saint after his death. Louis grew up a man of singularly pure personal character, with some firmness and much kindness of heart, an accomplished gentleman, a brave soldier, a conscientious—perhaps we might say a morbidly conscientious ruler, and an earnestly and sincerely religious and devout Christian. His devotion was more severely ecclesiastical than his father's; he had from time to time the desire to become a monk;

* Sismondi, 257.

his manners and tastes as well as his religious ideas were more Aquitanian than German; and it seems to me that his chief troubles arose from his real or supposed partiality at first for the Romance rather than the German element in his dominions. This would raise hopes on the part of the Romance or French element, which was represented by the high ecclesiastics, of a preponderance in the Empire, and correspondingly displease the Germans. It was probably the fear of this, which made Adelhard, Bernard and Wala, three brothers of great ability, who stood high in the counsels of Charlemagne, recommend him to make Bernard King of Italy, his grandson, Emperor instead of Louis. Bernard was the son of Charlemagne's eldest son Pepin, who died before his father, and had the laws of succession which hold at the present day prevailed then, he would have been the heir. For this offence or something similar, when Louis came to the throne, he banished the three brothers from the court, together with many others who had been about his father, and took for his chief adviser an Aquitanian Goth, a monk who under the name of Benedict of Aniane became famous for his own austerities, and for his extensive reform of monasticism as the minister of Louis. Wala and his brothers thereupon became the bitter enemies of Louis, and contributed materially to the disorders of his reign. They stirred up King Bernard of Italy to rebel against him; but Louis soon put down the insurrection, and Bernard lost his life through the severity with which the sen-

tence that condemned him to the loss of his eyes was executed.

On the other hand, when on the death of Benedict, Louis found out that he had made a political mistake,* and drew towards the Germans, pardoning the partisans of Bernard and giving them his confidence (he sent Wala to Italy as counsellor to his son Lothair, whom he appointed to succeed Bernard), the French hierarchy were perhaps disappointed. They had had much influence in the ecclesiastical legislation of 816 and 817, by which Louis carried through a great scheme for the permanent settlement, as he thought, of the Church and the Empire. The capitularies of those years dealt principally with ecclesiastical affairs; they aimed to bring all the clergy under the canonical rule of Chrodegang of Metz; they republished the Benedictine rule for monks, with the additions of Benedict of Aniane; they made a rule for canonesses, who wished to serve God in celibate communities without becoming nuns; they regulated the support of the parochial clergy and their relation to the bishops, improving their condition; and they made many other provisions for the good order of the Church. The bishops and abbots who were summoned to the diet doubtless assisted in shaping this legislation; they were consulted also in the arrangement made to secure

* It was a political mistake, and Louis' sensitive conscience made it into a sin for which he did public penance at the diet of Attigny (822), which was a still greater mistake.

the succession by which Lothair, King of Italy, became co-emperor, and Pepin and Louis, the other sons, became kings respectively of Aquitaine and Bavaria on the Spanish and eastern frontiers ; and they doubtless expected, as I said, to have the chief influence in directing the policy of the Empire. They had also taken the measure of Louis at the time of the penance of Attigny, and when he adopted a more German policy their disappointment made them disloyal, and they were ready to assist in humbling him when occasion served.

The Bishop of Rome, too, had his policy, if not his grievance. Louis had a high sense of the imperial prerogative ; he was firm in asserting his authority over the people and Church of Rome ; and the Pope was interested in weakening it so as to emancipate himself from it. It is to be remarked that the Pope was not consulted in the extensive reforms of 816 and 817 ; they were the act of the Frank Empire and Church, and were put forth as such, depending therefore upon the Emperor and not upon the Pope for their validity. The Pope was a subject of the empire, the chief ecclesiastic but nothing more. That subject-condition was galling. There is no doubt that when the Popes first appealed to the Franks for aid against the Lombards, they had no thought that the Franks would conquer Italy and incorporate it with their dominions. They wanted them for protectors because they were on the other side of the Lombards, and too distant to oppress them

as the Lombards threatened to do. They looked upon them too, as barbarians, and hoped to make the family of Pepin feel that they owed the crown to the Bishop of Rome. The Empire of Charlemagne, therefore, was a great disappointment to them. They could not trifle with the great Emperor himself; but when his sceptre passed to feebler hands they could throw off the yoke and perhaps reduce the Emperor himself to subjection. At least, if the Empire was to be, they might take the credit of it to themselves and bide their time. Leo III., anticipating the designs of Charles, crowned him by surprise. Charlemagne understood; and when Louis was declared Emperor, he made him take the crown himself from the altar, and put it upon his own head. But Stephen IV. managed to get the opportunity to repeat the coronation. Then in 823, Lothair, making a visit to Rome to keep Easter, was crowned by Paschal I. And so the tradition was established that the Emperor must be crowned by the Pope. Concurrent with this design there was another; the authority of the Emperor over the papal possessions and the Church of Rome must be shaken off. The enemies of Leo III. had been so violent that he had been obliged to have recourse to Charles, and Charles acted as judge in investigating the truth of the charges and countercharges. That act fixed the imperial authority in Rome. The coronation followed, and Leo was secure as long as Charlemagne lived. At his death the enmity broke out again; Leo arrested and inflicted capital

punishment upon the chiefs of the party opposed to him. Intelligence was sent to Louis ; he was highly offended at Leo's action as in derogation of his sovereignty, and commanded King Bernard to go to Rome and do justice as his deputy. Then Leo died, and Stephen IV. was consecrated in haste, but sent an excuse to the Emperor for not waiting for the presence of his legates because of the disturbed state of the city; his excuse was accepted as he had made the Romans swear fealty to the Emperor. In less than a year he died and Paschal I. was elected and consecrated in the same way ; he too apologized, but this time the Romans received an admonition not to offend again. In 823, as I said, Paschal crowned Lothair. But immediately after that, certain officials who had held high place at the coronation were put to death. Imperial commissioners were sent to investigate the affair. Paschal took oath that he was clear of offence, but refused to surrender the murderers or executioners and justified the act. Then Paschal died and there was a contested election. Eugenius was made Pope by the management of Wala, but the city was turbulent, and Lothair himself came to Rome. He demanded of the Pope why the friends of the Franks were insulted and offered violence. He made a constitution regulating the election of the Pope, and confirmed the statute which had been in force under the eastern emperors, that no Pope should be consecrated until his election had been ratified by the imperial authority. He also issued other decrees providing for

the imperial supremacy in the civil government and the administration of justice. Then Eugenius died, and Gregory IV. was made Pope with the sanction of Lothair. But his successor Sergius II. was consecrated without waiting for the imperial commissioners; and his successor Leo IV. found in the exigencies of the times reason for the same omission.

This carries us beyond the life of Louis the Pious, but it shows the policy of the Roman people and their bishops. There was thus in three directions, a disloyal and discontented spirit in the Church—Wala and his party in Germany, the French hierarchy, and the Bishop of Rome. And so it was that the Church failed in its duty at this particular time. Its duty was, in the interest of law and order, to uphold the central authority, to rectify mistakes by constitutional means, and to exert its influence to preserve peace. It was a grand idea, that of an Emperor over the confederated commonwealth of nations, preserving peace between the states by his authority, while each nationality was enabled to pursue its own course of development under its own king. It was an idea that did not seem impossible of realization. Sustained by the moral and spiritual power of the Church, the Empire might seem to have in it the elements of stability and endurance. The secular nobles might be expected to be turbulent and unruly, but that the Church should labor to overthrow it was not to be thought beforehand. And that it should do so under so religious a king as Louis is

almost beyond belief. And yet it was the very religiousness of the Emperor that betrayed it into the attempt. In this failure of duty is to be found the cause under the retributive justice of Divine Providence, of the affliction of the Church of France by the Northmen in the ninth century, and of the degradation of the see of Rome in the tenth. Had there been a strong government and a united Empire, neither of these results would have happened.

The turning points of the history of the ninth century are: the treachery of the Field of Lies in 833, the battle of Fontenailles in 841, and the Treaty of Verdun in 843. By the first a mortal wound was given to the Empire of Charlemagne; by the second the military power of the Franks was destroyed; and by the third, modern Europe came into existence.

For sixteen years Louis the Pious governed on the whole well and prosperously. The rebellion of Bernard was put down without any trouble, the power of the Empire was respected without its borders, and its authority within them. But in 829, Louis made the son of his second marriage (Charles was then six years old), Duke of Germany. This offended his half-brothers, Lothair, Louis and Pepin, who looked upon what was given to him as taken from them. They fomented discontent throughout the Empire, for which there were plausible pretexts in some inroads of the barbarians and Saracens, which had not been successfully resisted, in some bestowals of ecclesiastical fiefs upon laymen, and

in the public distress through bad harvests and pestilential diseases. An army which Louis raised for an expedition into Brittany refused to follow him, and a time of confusion ensued in which Louis was for a while the prisoner of his sons, and in which he deposed his son Pepin and gave his kingdom to Charles. Then the sons of Hermengarda rebelled in earnest. The winter of 832 was spent in organizing a wide-spread conspiracy. The bishops of France entered into it, and so did the Bishop of Rome. In the spring the insurgents assembled at the Rothfeld, near Colmar, in Alsace. The Emperor Louis encamped near them; in his army were the Bishops of Austrasia and Germany. The Pope was with Lothair. He professed that he had come to make peace, and neither side was in haste to shed blood. The Pope was permitted to pass to and fro between the camps; the nature of his negotiations is not understood; but the result of them was that on the night of June 24th, 833, the battalions of Louis passed over to the camp of his sons, and Louis being defenceless was taken prisoner. The armies then disbanded, leaving him in the custody of Lothair. Posterity has marked its sense of the infamy of this desertion of Louis, by giving to the place where it was effected, the name of the Field of Lies.

It is the part which the bishops took in this affair and its sequel, which creates the most surprise. It is evident that the different parties to this conspiracy were swayed by different motives, and pursuing

different objects. The three kings, Lothair, Pepin and Louis, were actuated by pure selfishness. What Gregory's motives were it is impossible to say; the account says that he returned to Rome in much grief. The German conspirators, Wala and the rest, were disgusted by the turn of affairs after the surrender of Louis, and like Gregory, went home as quickly as possible. But the French bishops had an object of their own. They were bent on making a demonstration of the superiority of the spiritual to the temporal power. They were not papalists; they were not desirous to aggrandize the Roman see; they wished to obtain the power for themselves. It seems to me that one cause of the "grief" of Gregory, and the sudden withdrawal of Wala, was this independence of the French bishops.* They had no such idea of the Roman authority as had been infused into the German Church by Boniface of Mentz; they had the ancient traditions of the Gallican Church to fall back on; and they had the idea of making the Neustrian side of the Frank kingdom superior to the Austrasian, and the Frankish Church, as a national Church, superior to the lay element in the national councils. All this comes out in the later history of Charles the Bald, and Hincmar of Rheims, and the same principles were at work now. The French bishops therefore seized upon this opportunity to make a demonstration—an unwise and un-

* Some of them told the Pope that if he came to excommunicate he should return excommunicated.

rightous demonstration of their spiritual authority, taking advantage of the morbid conscientiousness of the broken Emperor. They put Louis the Pious to public penance for his crimes against the State, crimes which were made out by attributing to him the disorders of which his sons had been the cause. The effect of that penance was intended to be, according to old canons, a permanent disqualification for bearing arms, and therefore a deposition from the Empire, since none but a soldier could be Emperor. But the effect was the reverse of what was intended. Public sympathy was aroused, Pepin and Louis returned to their allegiance, Lothair was compelled to set his father at liberty, the Austrasian bishops reconciled him to the Church and restored his arms, the Archbishops of Rheims, Lyons and Vienne, the chief metropolitans of the French Church, were deposed for their part in this unseemly proceeding, and Louis was again Emperor in fact, as well as in name. But nothing could restore the strength and unity of the Empire. Louis lived a few years longer in strife with his children ; he died June 20th, 840. On the Field of Lies, says Palgrave, the faith and honor of the Frankish nation perished forever.

On the death of Louis, disputes broke out more fiercely than ever between his sons. To punish their recurring rebellions, Louis had in successive diets made no less than ten different partitions of the Empire, in each of which he augmented the portion of Charles at the expense of the others. The last partition had reduced

Louis the German (as he is known in history) to Bavaria alone, and divided the rest between Lothair and Charles. Louis advanced his authority as far as the Rhine ; a son of Pepin disputed Aquitaine with Charles, and Lothair claimed imperial authority over all his brothers according to the original settlement. In some way an understanding was arrived at between Louis and Charles, and they combined against Lothair. In June, 841, the armies of the three brothers met, and appealed to the judgment of God at the battle of Fontenailles. That battle, it is said, was the most desperate and bloody of any which had been fought by the Franks, since Charles Martel defeated the Saracens. It destroyed their military power, and laid the Empire open to the incursions of its Saracen and barbarian enemies. Lothair was beaten, but his brothers were so badly crippled that they were unable to follow up their victory. All the same the battle of Fontenailles was one of the decisive battles of the world. It settled the fate of the Empire of Charlemagne, and handed Europe over to a century of lawlessness and misery, which is perhaps the darkest in its history.

The immediate result was the Treaty of Verdun two years later. Lothair retreated to Aachen and gathered a new army of Saxons, Germans and Austrasians, with which he intended to attack Charles. But an overflow of the Seine prevented, and Charles made another junction with Louis, where they and their respective peoples took those memorable oaths, which give us the

most ancient examples of the vernacular speech both of the French and German. But there was no more disposition to fight on either side; the partisans of Lothair began to desert him, and the people demanded a peaceful settlement of the contending claims. Lothair proposed a treaty of peace in which the first article was to be the independence of the kingdoms of Louis and Charles. Lothair was to have Italy, Louis Bavaria, and Charles Aquitaine. The rest of the Empire was to be divided into three equal portions, of which Lothair was to have the first choice. Each chose forty of his nobles as commissioners to make the division; but when they came together they found that they were unacquainted with the extent and relative value of the various provinces, and it was determined to make a survey of the whole Empire. The number of commissioners was increased to three hundred, and by August of the following year the report was made to the three kings. Upon that report a division was made by the Treaty of Verdun. What we may call France was given to Charles the Bald, Germany to Louis, and Italy, with a strip of territory between the Rhine and the Meuse, extending north and south from the confines of the Empire to Italy, to Lothair. The modern name of Lorraine is a memorial of this division. It has always been a debateable land between France and Germany. "All the subsequent history of Europe" says Sir Francis Palgrave "is an exposition of the Treaty of Verdun."

But it was to be a long time before France and Germany were consolidated into the powerful nations of the Middle Ages and of modern times. The immediate consequence of the Treaty of Verdun was to reduce the imperial name to a mere titular designation of the sovereign who had possession of Italy, and to hand over the kingdoms carved out of the Empire to a period of anarchy and confusion. And now the Church was called upon by the righteous retribution of Providence to pay the penalty of its attempt to control the civil government, and of its participation in the events which destroyed the Empire. We are never to forget that there are three Divine institutions, to each of which is committed its definite authority over the individual, and to each of which is given its distinct sphere of influence in the government and training of mankind—the family, the nation and the Church. Destroy or cripple either of these institutions, the effect is disastrous to society. Let either of them interfere, as such, within the sphere of the others, the result is confusion and weakness. At the present day the tendency is to ignore the Divine authority of the Church, even within its own spiritual sphere, and the consequence is an increasing laxity in the family relation, and a diminishing respect for law and authority in the State. I hold that in the ninth century it was a more pardonable mistake to suppose that the Church might rightly and beneficially undertake to direct the public as well as the private conduct of princes and the policy of the

State. But still a mistake it was. When the ecclesiastical authorities felt themselves called upon, not merely to take part in the common deliberations for the welfare of the State in which they were equally citizens with their laymen, but to decide *ex cathedra* upon the policy to be pursued, one of two results must follow: either the public policy would be directed from an ecclesiastical and monastic standpoint, and those interests be neglected which it requires the lay mind to appreciate and the military arm to uphold ; or else the ecclesiastic, to be a capable and efficient governor and statesman must become assimilated to the layman in habits of mind and action, more than is seemly in view of his professed devotion to the sacred ministry. Out of the union of Church and State at this period, both of these results emerged. In Germany the prelates became great lay-lords so to speak ; although they were in holy orders their habits and modes of thought and life were very much those of the lay nobles to whose families they belonged ; and I must confess that while I see the manifold evils of the system that required it, and which I am endeavoring to explain, I do not join in the indiscriminate condemnation of these apparently worldly statesmen and soldier-bishops of the dark ages. They had at least a better appreciation of the requirements of the times than the more ecclesiastical French prelates who humiliated Louis the Pious and ruled Charles the Bald. These French prelates, though they make a much better appearance in ecclesiastical history,

brought the kingdom of France to the lowest depths of anarchy and weakness. There is no grander figure in the Church history of this period than Hincmar the great Archbishop of Rheims; he was the equal of Pope Nicholas I., and the superior of Adrian II.; he successfully asserted the liberties of the Gallican Church against papal aggression; he directed the policy of Charles the Bald, and secured the throne upon his death to Louis the Stammerer, his son; and yet in his last year (882) he was driven out of his see in the interior of France by the Northmen, and died at a distance from it. The great preponderance of the ecclesiastical over the lay or military aristocracy in France at this time, and the direction of affairs from the standpoint of ecclesiastical politics were the causes of the defencelessness of France against the Northmen; and the tremendous desolation of the country for the half-century succeeding the "Field of Lies" was the temporal punishment of their disloyalty on that occasion.

The ravages of the Northmen on the sea-coast and along the great rivers which gave them access by boats into the interior, although they were felt severely in Germany, and form a large part of the history of England for this period, spent their most destructive fury upon France. It seems almost incredible that Charles the Bald and his ecclesiastical counsellors, while they were active in endeavoring to extend his power at the expense of his brothers and nephews in Germany and

Italy, should have made no attempts to protect the kingdom they already possessed from these devastating inroads. Yet so it was. The vision of an ecclesiastical empire infatuated them ; they aimed to reconstruct Charlemagne's scheme with the Church predominant, and they were more intent upon this than upon the national defence. They even prohibited the building of castles as a protection against the Northmen, and razed to the ground some that had been begun by the barons themselves on their own lands, fearing more the revival of a military spirit than careful of the true interests of France. And so for three-quarters of a century France was exposed, virtually defenceless, to the attacks of these barbarian and pagan hordes, whose rage was especially directed against the churches and monasteries, and whose appetite for plunder was whetted rather than satiated by the treasures of which they despoiled them. These piratical incursions began to be of importance at the very time of the Field of Lies. Just after that dishonorable transaction, the Northmen appear burning churches and monasteries at the mouth of the Scheldt, and threatening the cities of the Rhine. In 841, a month before the battle of Fontenailles, they entered the Seine, plundered and burned Rouen, and destroyed towns and monasteries as they made their way back to the sea. In 843, the year of the Treaty of Verdun, they passed up the Loire and sacked the city of Nantes ; they massacred the bishop and priests with the people who had taken refuge in the Cathedral.

Two years after that they plundered Paris, where they hanged a hundred and eleven persons in front of the royal camp, Charles lying there afraid to attack them. After they had plundered the city, Charles paid them seven thousand pounds of silver to go away, and so ensured their speedy return.

These devastations continued through the rest of the century. The mere enumeration of the places plundered by the Northmen, as given by Robertson, conveys the most vivid idea of the misery of the times: "They repeatedly plundered the more exposed cities; such as Hamburg, Dorstadt and Bordeaux; they ascended the Rhine to Mentz, and even to Worms; the Moselle to Treves; the Somme to Amiens; the Seine to Rouen and to Paris, once the Merovingian capital, and still the chief city of Neustria, rich in churches and in treasures, and having the royal monastery of St. Denys in its immediate neighborhood. From Paris they made their way up the Marne to Meaux and Chalons, up the Yonne to Sens and Auxerre. The Loire gave them a passage to Tours, the city of St. Martin, and to Orleans; the Vienne to Limoges; the Charente to Saintes and Angouleme; the Garonne to Toulouse. * * * After a time, growing bolder through impunity, they would leave their vessels on the great rivers and strike across the unresisting country to pillage inland places of noted wealth, such as Ghent, Beauvais, Chartres, Bourges, Rheims, Laon, and Charle-

magne's own city of Aix, where they stabled their horses in the imperial palace."*

"Thus," says Michelet, "was proved the inability of the episcopal power to defend and govern France." I believe that these tremendous devastations were, as I have said, Divine judgments upon the Church of France for its share in breaking up the Empire. In those barbarous times, the possessors of such civilization as remained (and they were the clergy and the monks) ought to have known that to keep the Empire intact was the only way to secure peace upon its borders, surrounded as it was with active enemies and untamed barbarians. To be at peace it must be strong enough to compel peace. The political vice of the Frank system was the division of the sovereignty among all the surviving sons of a deceased monarch; the remedy was as Charlemagne and Louis the Pious foresaw and provided, the imperial prerogative, keeping the supreme rule in a single hand, and governing as subordinates the kings who inherited by Frank custom their separate portions of the common territory. Without this, western Christendom must suffer disintegration, and its diminishing fragments would be weak to resist invasion from without or anarchy within. The supreme duty of the clergy, as a political power, was to sustain the Empire by unswerving loyalty to the central authority; and because they failed in that duty, their sanctuaries were

* Robertson, Ch. History, B. IV., Ch. II., p. 294. 8vo edition.

profaned, their monasteries devastated, and their estates turned into deserts or appropriated by laymen.

This disintegration, proceeding as long as there were heirs to a deceased king, and only fortuitously arrested by the failure of one or another branch of the family tree, was the great cause of the moral and political decay of Europe in the ninth and tenth centuries. By the Treaty of Verdun, the Empire was divided into three independent sovereignties, under Lothair, who bore the title of Emperor, Louis the Germanic, and Charles the Bald. In the next generation seven kingdoms were made for the two sons of Lothair, the three of Louis, and the two of Charles. But these were not all contemporaneous. Lothair and his two sons died before Louis and Charles, and they divided their dominions, Charles becoming Emperor for two years. Louis and Charles died within a year of each other (876–7) and then there were five or six contemporaneous kingdoms. In a few years more five of the kings were dead without heirs, and the remaining son of Louis the Germanic, known in history as Charles the Fat, succeeded to the whole, and for a short time it seemed as if the Empire were reunited. But Charles the Fat had so little real power and showed so little ability that his people deposed him; and France reverted to a grandson of Charles the Bald, known as Charles the Simple, while the Germans set up Arnulph, an illegitimate son of Carloman, of Bavaria. At the same time a Kingdom of Provence was formed in the South of France, and a noble named Boson, who

was connected with the Carlovingians only by marriage was made king; and Italy and the imperial title were disputed by two powerful Italian nobles, Guido and Berengar. At the end of the ninth century there were seven kingdoms in what had been the Empire. But the disintegration went farther. In the attempts to possess themselves of the governments that fell vacant by the lapse of heirs, the surviving kings weakened the royal authority by conferring privileges and benefices upon their partisans, and making concessions to them. Charles the Bald, in his eagerness to obtain the title of Emperor, acknowledged not only the Empire, but the kingdoms of France and Italy to be elective, while he conceded not only fiefs but counties and lordships to be hereditary—thus strengthening the inferior while he weakened the superior. The revenues of the great abbeys were assigned to lords whose interest it was important to gain, while all benefices which enriched the vassal were so much taken away from the estates and revenues of the king. In a short time there were nobles who, although entitled only dukes or counts, were in reality independent sovereigns, more powerful and more wealthy than the king to whom they owed allegiance but did not obey. M. Guizot enumerates twenty-nine of these fiefs in France, at the end of the ninth century; by the end of the tenth they had increased to fifty-five.

In the decay of the Empire of Charlemagne, Western Christendom was exposed on all its sides to the devas-

tations of heathen or Mohammedan enemies. Not only the Northmen on the west and north, but the Slavs and Hungarians on the east and the Saracens on the south made their predatory inroads with impunity, and carried devastation and misery into all the exposed provinces. Under these circumstances the first step towards the regeneration of Germany, as well as of France was necessarily the revival of its military power. On the lapse of the direct Carlovingian line, Arnulph, an illegitimate son of Carloman (Emperor before Charles the Fat), became King of Germany and titular Emperor. He was an able man, and checked the ravages of the Northmen on the German rivers. His line ended with his son Louis the Child. The Germans then elected Conrad of Franconia, and on his death Henry of Saxony (Henry the Fowler), A.D. 919. At the accession of Henry the Germans were so depressed that they paid tribute to the Hungarians as the price for a truce of ten years. During this ten years Henry devoted himself to the training of his people in the use of arms; the nobles were taught by tournaments to fight on horseback, and the men of lower rank were assembled near their villages every third day for military exercises. Henry also built walled towns as places of refuge and defence, and required that provisions should be stored, and markets and fairs held in them. When his preparations were complete, he refused further tribute to the Magyars, and defeated them in battle. His son Otho the Great completed the deliverance of Germany, and

in a few years the Hungarians themselves professed Christianity under their King St. Stephen.

In France, the national revival took the same course. I have mentioned that Charles the Bald prohibited the building of castles by the holders of fiefs, notwithstanding the need of fortifications upon the navigable rivers, and his own culpable negligence in not erecting them. In spite of that prohibition castles were built, and more and more in the following reigns. The owners of these castles while they were oppressive to the people, and given to plunder on occasion, and free to wage war against each other on their own account, yet felt the necessity of protecting their own vassals as far as they were able; and under their leadership the military spirit of the French nation began to revive. Some of the nobles like Robert the Strong, of Paris, and his son Eudes, were able to defeat the Normans and to drive them back. The Normans themselves having reduced much of the country to a desert, found less to plunder, and began to make settlements upon the waste lands which they had ruined. In 911 Charles the Simple granted to Rollo, the Norman chief, the great fief which was afterwards known as Normandy, the duke of which became the first peer of the realm. The Norman, thus admitted within the pale of civilized and Christian Europe, speedily advanced in culture and increased in power, and played a prominent part in history. In these ways a military aristocracy was formed, balancing the political influence of the Churchmen; and the result was

ultimately beneficial to the State and to the Church, although fatal to the Carlovingian princes. In 987, Hugh Capet, a descendant of Robert the Strong, the first of these nobles in rank and power, was crowned King of France, and the last Carlovingian was treated as a rebel against him. But many years were yet to pass, before the French monarchy extended its rule over the whole of France.

Connected with this revival of the power to cope with foreign enemies, there was the restoration of some sort of internal order by the development of the feudal system under which, through the due subordination of fiefs, the legal and moral authority of the sovereign was admitted in theory, and, as the physical power attended the moral authority, was gradually established in fact. At the same time there appear during this period indications of reviving municipal life ; the cities, particularly in Italy, thrown upon themselves for defence, rebuilt their walls, their magistrates received an accession of authority to meet the responsibility thrown upon them, industry revived and the population began to increase. In Germany also, the Emperors favored the urban population, and the free imperial cities and the towns founded and sustained by the policy of Henry the Fowler and his successors, became important factors in the body politic.

Now what I want to point out particularly is, that with this revival of the military and political spirit in the new nations of Europe, there proceeded with equal

steps a revival of the religious spirit; showing that whatever may have been the difficulties of the times, and whatever truth there may be in the accusation that the great prelates, clerical and monastic, were secularized by their connection with political events, the heart of the Church was still sound, and in despite of the superstition and ignorance and violence of the age, it was doing Christ's work among the people. And it is important to note, in view of subsequent developments, that this revival was independent of Rome, and most apparent to the north of the Alps. The religious reforms of Charlemagne and Louis the Pious bore their fruits in obscurity it may be, but they did bear them, and we may not doubt when we find an earnest religious movement spreading everywhere in the eleventh century, that its roots were taking hold in the tenth. In the first place, the habits of study introduced into the monasteries and cathedrals by the enlightened policy of Charlemagne did not die out in the succeeding period. Such men as Hincmar, Scotus Erigena, Gottschalk and others, and the controversies in which they were engaged, show a mental activity for which we look in vain under the later Merovingians, or the mayors of the palace; and the fact that the libraries, composed of manuscripts written with difficulty, and therefore costly and precious, were made up chiefly of the Holy Scriptures, the commentaries of the Fathers, and the lives of the saints, brought the studiously inclined much nearer the pure

Word of God, than we might be at first inclined to suppose from what is popularly believed concerning the dark ages. And whatever may be said of the ignorance of the parochial clergy, those of them who could read at all (and they had to be able to do that to perform their office), would find in the office-books of the Church and the extracts from Holy Scripture which they contained, the sum of Christian doctrine, and the Word of God, to guide them in such instruction as they gave their people. Then again, the changes in the penitential system of the Church, faulted by rigorous canonists at the time, as well as in later ages, as corruptions, nevertheless bear witness to the sense of sin, and the need of repentance, and were a practical attempt to bring it home to the conscience of the sinner. The ritual of the Church was on the whole pure and uncorrupt, and brought the worshipper into the presence of God with reverence and devotion, and instructed him in the faith of Christ by the round of fast and festival and the course of the Christian year. The successful prosecution of extensive missions in the tenth century, not only by the Greek Church in Russia, but by the German Church in Denmark and Sweden, in Bohemia and Hungary, shows the spiritual vitality of the German Church. The Saxon Emperors, Henry the Fowler, and the Othos were profoundly and sincerely religious men; the last of the line, Henry II., is a saint as well as an Emperor, and a saint of the kind it befits a devout layman, and a vigorous and wise Emperor to be. Henry III., the son

of Conrad the head of the Franconian line, under whom the Hildebrandine movement began, was one of the most devout, as well as one of the greatest sovereigns of the Middle Ages. The Church which had such sons, and in whose bosom were nourished the German Popes who preceded Hildebrand and restored the moral and religious tone of the papacy after its disgraceful history of the tenth century, had not been unfaithful to its trust.

In France, likewise, just as soon as the kingdom began to settle down, as well as in Northern Italy when the imperial power was restored, there is evidence of like survival of real religious influence through these disorderly times. The extensive monastic reforms of Clugny, of Camaldoli, of Vallombrosa, with their allied orders, which belong to this period, revived the life of the great Benedictine family, and affected the whole Church of these regions. In Normandy, we find immense religious activity—not perhaps always of the kind we should like to see, but real in this, that it is founded distinctly on the faith in Christ as the Saviour of mankind and the ruler of the world. The Truce of God, originating in Aquitaine in the early part of the eleventh century, was an attempt of the Church to mitigate the miseries of private warfare, and it spread thence through other regions, bearing witness to the desire of the Church to obtain the beatitude of the peacemakers. In fact, through all this period it is true, what M. Guizot says of the Middle Ages in general,

that they contrast with the early history of Greek and Roman society by the presence of a lofty ideal in the midst of a conduct which falls far short of it. "In these middle ages which we are studying," he says, "facts are habitually detestable; crimes, disorders of all kinds abound; and still men have in their minds, in their imaginations, pure, elevated instincts and desires; their notions of virtue are far more developed, their ideas of justice incomparably better than what is practised around them, than what they often practise themselves. A certain moral idea hovers over their rude, tempestuous society, and attracts the regard, obtains the respect of men whose life scarcely ever reflects its image. Christianity must doubtless be ranked among the number of the principal causes of this fact; its precise characteristic is to inspire men with a great moral ambition, to hold constantly before their eyes a type infinitely superior to human reality, and to excite them to reproduce it." The "precise characteristic" of Christianity is something much higher than this, but let that pass. The facts noted in this extract show themselves in the period of which I am speaking. Just as soon as the central governments of the several nations gathered strength again, the strength of the religious influence shows itself in various directions, and proves that the national churches were healthy and sound.

V.

PAPALISM.

V.

PAPALISM.

We have now to consider the great movement which exalted the Papacy to the head of Western Christendom. We have seen in the last lecture the collapse of the imperialist scheme of Charlemagne, in which the head of the State was also head of the Church ; the natural reaction was to the opposite extreme, to a theory by which it was assumed that there is an earthly head of the visible Church, and that this head of the Church is, by virtue of his spiritual authority, also head of the State. This theory was fully worked out and reduced to practice by the monk Hildebrand, who became Pope by the name of Gregory VII., and it is therefore conveniently called the Hildebrandine theory, and the period in which it flourished the Hildebrandine period. The Hildebrandine period of the Papacy lasted from the accession of Leo IX., A.D. 1048, to the death of Boniface VIII., A.D. 1303, a term of 255 years. The power of the Roman pontiff then suffered a collapse as complete and disastrous as ever befel human monarchy. It will be the object of the next lecture to trace the causes of that collapse ; in the present lecture, I purpose to

set forth the rise and progress of the Papal idea, and its workings during the period of its supremacy.

We are under no need of refusing to admit that the Papal theory, as held by its promoters, was a theory of Reformation. I have before remarked that it is an error to speak of the great crisis of the sixteenth century as if it were the only reform or attempted reform of the Church. The whole history of the Church is a constant struggle with the evil of the world; and therefore any period of great religious activity is a period of reformation. The imperialist movement of Charlemagne was a reformation; so was the Papalist movement of Hildebrand; so was the movement for reformation by councils in the fifteenth century. In fact the Church is always endeavoring to reform itself—that is, to adapt itself to the changes in human society, and to remove those abuses which have grown up through want of adaptation to the altered circumstances of advancing time. There is an unchangeable order in the divine constitution of the Church, and there is a changeable order; to tamper with the one is a corruption of the order of the Church, to crystallize or fossilize the other is likewise a corruption; there are therefore corruptions of innovation and corruptions of conservatism; and it is our duty as faithful and wise stewards, in bringing out of our treasures things new and old, to judge wisely and rightly concerning that which is new and that which is old. The Catholic Church is adapted to all states and conditions

of human life and human society; it works equally in an empire and in a republic, among rude, illiterate peoples, and among the most polished and cultured. And it will adapt itself to its field of work by rightly arranging the changeable elements of its organization, while preserving immutable the unchangeable elements of its divine order. The feudal Church would not work well in the nineteenth century; but neither would the nineteenth century Church have worked well in feudal times; and yet both in the feudal ages and in the nineteenth century the bishops of the Church are true bishops, its worship a true worship, and its sacraments food for the faithful and the penitent. Take it as a guiding principle in your study of ecclesiastical history, that—the essentials of the divine order being preserved, the threefold Ministry, the Creeds, the Holy Scriptures and the Sacraments necessary to salvation—the other arrangements are subject to revision according to the changes of times and men's manners; and that the conservative and the progressive may honestly differ as to the expediency or the necessity of any proposed change, and may earnestly contend each for his own side; you will then have the key to the explanation of the movements you are studying, without the necessity of thinking every difference from our system of the present day to be a corruption, or of attributing every seeming corruption to the immorality of the priesthood, and every project of reform to their unhallowed ambition. A too stubborn conservatism may

make the laudable expedient of one age the corruption of the next; a too sanguine progressivism may introduce a corruption in the theory intended to justify a practical effort at reform.

But while we admit that the promoters of the Hildebrandine theory desired and intended that it should be the means of a reformation of manifest evils in the imperialist system, we must not blind our eyes to the facts of history, which show its real nature and operation. Our objection to the Papacy is not that it was a powerful factor in politics and religion in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries—its influence, great as it was, has been much overrated—but that it claims to be a divine and unchangeable institution, essential to the Church; when its history in its rise, culmination and decline shows it to be no such thing. And therefore we are under no obligation to asperse the character of the great Popes of this period, because we see them to have been working on a false theory of their power and its responsibilities. Our objections to the Papacy do not lie against this or that Pope, but against the Papal theory itself; the men who believed in it and endeavored to administer it honestly were honest men; but their theory was none the less false; their assumptions were not facts; the divine right of the Papacy to supreme rule over Church and State is not a fact; and the proof that it is not a fact lies in the history of the Papacy itself—in the various steps by which its usurpation was established, in the failure to make good its

claim when its power was at its height, in the woful collapse of the fourteenth, and the dreadful moral degradation of the fifteenth centuries.

The germ of the Hildebrandine theory of the Papacy is to be found in that remarkable collection published some time in the first half of the ninth century, known as the False Decretals. While the visions of ecclesiastical supremacy of which I spoke in the last lecture were misleading the chiefs of the Neustrian or French Church, and ruining the Neustrian Kingdom, other visions of the relation of Church and State were working in the brain of some unknown dreamer or dreamers in that part of Germany or Austrasia which had been the scene of the labors of St. Boniface. I have before remarked on the peculiar relation of St. Boniface to the see of Rome, and also upon the condition of the Austrasian Episcopate in his day. St. Boniface had been acknowledged as primate of the German and Austrasian Church by reason of his "apostolic vicariate," and had endeavored to revive the authority of the metropolitans, which had fallen into abeyance, and to bring them into subordination to the see of Rome, by persuading them to accept the pallium. But the bishops, who had, in the political changes of the preceding period, thrown off the metropolitan government, were unwilling to have it restored as a substantive power, especially as in the new relation to the Empire the metropolitans were more closely related to the princes, and were the means by which they exercised their

authority over the Church. Out of these apparently contradictory elements there was formulated a theory of the Church constitution, and of its relation to the State, which were set forth in the False Decretals. That it was not the primitive theory is evident from the necessity of supporting it by forged documents; neither was it the fully developed theory of Gregory VII. and his successors, for it does not seem to assert the Papal supremacy over the secular government. It evidently grew out of the circumstances of the time, and the desire to emancipate the ecclesiastical body from that control by the lay power which had been the principle of the reforms of Charlemagne. In the opinion of careful students, the False Decretals were not forged in the interest of Rome, although Rome ultimately reaped the benefit of them; their object rather was to make the bishops independent of all immediate authority, whether lay or ecclesiastical, by subordinating them to the distant and therefore less intrusive jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome. The pretext for their publication is stated with naive simplicity in the preface to the completed collection. It appears that the administration of justice was so improved since the barbarian codes had been reduced to writing, that the judges were accustomed to demand the written text as the basis of their decisions, and therefore the authors of the False Decretals set themselves to supply a code of ecclesiastical law which should meet this requirement. "Many good Christians," say they, "are reduced to

silence, and compelled to bear the sins of others against their own better knowledge, because they are unprovided with documents by which they might convince ecclesiastical judges of the truth of what they know to be the law; seeing that though what they allege may be altogether right, yet it is not heeded by the judges unless it be confirmed by written documents, or by recorded decisions, or made to appear in the course of some known judicial proceeding." They therefore added to the genuine code as compiled by Isidore of Seville, "the decretal epistles of certain apostolic men, * * as many," they say, "as we have been enabled to find, down to Pope Sylvester; after these we have annexed the rest of the decretals of the Roman prelates down to St. Gregory [the Great], together with certain epistles of that pontiff; in all which, by virtue of the dignity of the Apostolic See, resideth authority equal to that of the Councils: so that the discipline of the ecclesiastical order being thus by our labors reduced and digested into one body of law, the holy bishops may be instructed in the entire rules of the fathers; and thus obedient ministers and people may be imbued with spiritual precedents, and be no longer deceived by the practices of the wicked."* The collection, therefore, which goes by the name of the

* I take the above from Greenwood's Cathedra Petri, Vol. III., pages 182-4. At Nashotah I had the use of Hinschius' edition of the False Decretals, and made myself, in a general way, familiar with its contents; but am not now able to refer to it.

False Decretals, purported to be the complete body of canon and decretal law then existing; it contains many genuine though garbled documents, and the forgeries of preceding ages, such as the "Donation of Constantine," as well as those which the compilers forged for the occasion. It was intended to be cited in the ecclesiastical courts as the law for the clergy, just as Salic law was cited for the Franks, or Gothic law for the Goths, or Roman law for the Romans. And as so cited, it was intended, as I said, to secure immunity to the clergy, absolutely from all secular jurisdiction, and proximately from the immediate jurisdiction of the metropolitans. It attained this last result by allowing an appeal to Rome *before* the trial of a case; thus transferring it to a distant tribunal, where witnesses could not appear, and therefore where an accusation would naturally fall to the ground. The ultimate object seems to have been to weld the hierarchy into a compact body, centred in the see of Rome, self-governed and independent of all other power whatsoever.

Now of course it is a great blot upon ecclesiastical history that the False Decretals exist. They are undeniable forgeries, touching the most sacred of all matters, the Constitution of the Church of Christ. But I must point out to you in passing, that the moral responsibility for them rests, not upon the Church of the ninth century at large, but upon the individuals who composed them, and upon the see of Rome which adopted and enforced them. As a matter of fact they

were not generally received and acted upon, until the political force of the Hildebrandine movement gave them vitality, and they were incorporated in the *Decretum* of Gratian. At the same time the condition of learning was such, in the absence of the printing-press, that one who possessed a genuine code of the canons in his cathedral library, could not be sure that that was all of the canon law then in existence. Manuscripts were fragmentary; one was better than another; and the presumption was that the one which contained the most was the best. We need not wonder, therefore, at the hesitation of men who felt that the system of the decretals was not the system of the Church, and yet were not sure that the documents were forgeries, because they had not seen them before; nor need we deny the sincerity of men who accepted them when they were published, being without the critical knowledge to detect their falsehood. Such an apology, however, can scarcely be made for the Bishops of Rome who first adopted them. They must have known that they were not genuine.*

While this dream of ecclesiastical immunity was being indulged north of the Alps, what was the actual state of the Roman see? When the False Decretals first saw the light, there sat in the chair of St. Peter

* Disingenuously, Nicholas I. replied to Hincmar, who threw doubts upon the authroity of some citations: That the Church of Rome could not be ignorant of documents which were in its own archives. See the letter in Labbe Concilia, Vol. X., Col. 282.

one of its great bishops, Nicholas I. I need only allude to his three great causes, the affairs of Photius and Ignatius of Constantinople, the divorce of King Lothair, and the controversies with Hincmar of Rheims to bring his personality before you. What it is important to remark is, that he was chosen by the direct influence of the Emperor Louis (grandson of Louis the Pious), the last of the Carlovingians who had any real power in Italy. Nicholas was succeeded by Hadrian II., a respectable and able Pope, and he by John VIII., still in the reign of Louis. But Louis died in 876, and then, although Charles the Bald and others after him of the Carlovingian line bore the name of Emperor, the real power of the imperial office was in abeyance, as we have seen, for nearly a century. The title passed to that potentate who was most powerful in Italy, and was given to or usurped by several Italian nobles. It was not until Otho the Great was crowned at Rome in 962, that there was a real Emperor, in power as well as in name; and it was not until 1045 (with the exception of a short period (circa 1000) under Otho III., who made the illustrious Gerbert Pope under the name of Sylvester II.) that the Emperor intervened directly in the affairs of the Papacy. Now through all this period—that is, from the latter part of the ninth to the middle of the eleventh century, the Papacy was in a state of the most abject degradation. Italy was filled with disorders by the turbulent barons who quarreled over its dismembered carcase; the Saracens enacted in the

Mediterranean the part that the Northmen did in France; and Rome and its bishopric were the prey of the lawless aristocracy who held the rule over it for the time. During the first half of the tenth century the Papal chair was occupied by the creatures, paramours and connections of those infamous women, the two Theodoras and Marozia; then, after Otho had deposed the last and worst of them, John XII., there was a time in which Popes were set up and put down, banished or murdered, as one faction or another came into power; then Otho III. made two respectable Popes, one a German, Gregory V., the other a Frenchman, Sylvester II.;* but the united reigns of these were only seven years (A. D. 996-1003); and then there came in the line of Tusculan Popes, creatures of the Counts of Tusculum, for forty years—the last of whom, Benedict IX., was so vile that his archpresbyter, who took the name of Gregory VI., thought he was doing a meritorious act in purchasing his right to the Papal chair for a sum of money.

Baronius in narrating the history of the Papacy during this period, is saved from the temptation to palliate its enormities by the thought that its regeneration from such a moral sepulchre in the succeeding age is a manifest proof of its divine origin and indefeasible authority.

* "With the substitution of these men for the profligate priests of Italy, began that Teutonic reform of the Papacy which raised it from the abyss of the tenth century to the point where Hildebrand found it. The Emperors were working the ruin of their power by their most disinterested acts."—Bryce's *Holy Roman Empire*, 146.

The argument is a neat one in the hands of a Papal controversialist, but it will not bear examination. If the Papacy, as such—if the Bishop of Rome, simply as bishop of his own city according to the primitive system—had that inherent sanctity which the Papal theory requires, he should have appeared, at this time especially, when all the other foundations of the earth were out of course, as the conservator of religion and morality. He should not have succumbed to the evil of the times; he should have shown himself the preserver of order, the supporter of good government; the influence which regenerated society should have flowed forth from Rome, instead of flowing in towards Rome from the restored Empire. What was the fact? Is it not plain upon the surface that the revival of religion to the north of the Alps preceded and effected the moral restoration of the Roman see?—that the aggrandizement of the Papacy in the last half of the eleventh century depended upon, as it followed after, the revival of the Empire and of the Kingdom of France in the latter half of the tenth century?—that the new blood of its infused vitality was German blood and French blood? The purely political character of the Papacy is manifest, not only in the previous history of its relation to the Byzantine Empire, but in its abeyance at this time, when it could find no great political antagonist.

I spoke at the close of the last lecture of the indications of a healthy religious condition which attended the

restoration of political order, and which are so plainly manifest in France and Germany while the Papacy was thus wallowing in the mire. One of the principal sources of religious influence at that time was the monastery of Clugny. This celebrated monastery, of which so much that is delightful reading is told us by Dr. Maitland, was founded as far back as the year 912 by William, Duke of Auvergne, by whose charter it was to be free "from all interference of the founder and his family, of the king's majesty, and of every earthly power." Clugny was situated in the diocese of Macon in Burgundy, which was at that time a part of the Empire. Its influence spread far and wide ; it adopted a system of lay affiliation which drew persons in secular life within its circle ; the Emperor Henry II. was a *confrater* of Clugny. Clugny began to be a power in the religious world under Odo, the second abbot, who succeeded to the government in 927. He had been devoted by his father, while in the cradle, to the service of God in the Church of St. Martin at Tours, and was brought up by Count Fulk the Good, who was a canon of that church. At the age of seventeen his father withdrew him, and placed him in the military service of the Duke of Auvergne ; but an inveterate headache from which he suffered was taken as a judgment upon him for deserting the Church, and he returned to Tours, where he became schoolmaster and precentor. Later he studied at Paris under Remigius of Auxerre, and in 909 joined himself to Berno to lead the monastic life, bring-

ing with him his library of one hundred volumes. He was with Berno when he became the first abbot of Clugny, and was chosen to succeed him. Clugny was fortunate in its abbots. In two hundred years it had but six. Under Odo it became a home of learning as well as piety. Odo was succeeded by Aymar, and he, becoming blind, by Maiolus, who refused the earnest solicitations of Otho II. to accept the Papacy. Maiolus governed the monastery forty-six years; he was succeeded by Odilo, who was abbot fifty-five years, and he by Hugh, who held that office sixty years, entering upon it in the year after Leo IX. became Pope (1049). Under these saintly and experienced rulers, Clugny promoted a reformation of the monastic life, not merely within its own walls, but among many affiliated foundations. The Cluniac monks were the first "order" in the proper technical sense. The Benedictine was the general rule of the monks, but the Benedictine monasteries were not organized into an order; each was independent of the others, and they were connected together in a common interest only by the common rule. Under Odilo the practice of affiliating other monasteries to Clugny began, and the organization of the "Congregation" was completed by Hugh, who is said to have ruled over ten thousand monks. By the end of the twelfth century, Robertson tells us, the number of monasteries connected with Clugny, in France, in Germany, in Italy, in England and in Spain, amounted to two thousand.

Now Hildebrand, though an Italian, was a monk of Clugny, and you can readily see how, when he became the power behind the Papal throne, and ultimately the Pope himself, the whole Cluniac order became the compactly organized and disciplined spiritual army of the Papacy. By its means the entire monastic interest was enlisted on the side of the Popes against the secular ecclesiastics who were to be reduced to subjection to the Papal despotism. It ramified, as has been seen, into every country, its credit with the people was great, its power therefore to organize public opinion in favor of the Papal designs was immense. I have heard it said that the secret of the successful assertion of the Papal supremacy was that the monks appropriated the Papacy; and as the monks were looked upon as the true exponents of religion, obedience to the Papacy, when supported by them, would seem to the people to be the safeguard of religion in all men. The contest of the Papacy with the national Churches was the contest of the abbot with the bishop, of the monk with the priest; and this accounts for many things, and among others for the ruthlessness with which at the Reformation Henry VIII. swept the monks out of England.

There was another influence, I think, working upon Hildebrand at Clugny, which had much to do with shaping his ideas of the Papacy, and his policy as its moving spirit. Odilo, who was abbot of Clugny while Hildebrand was a monk there, was one of the great

promoters of that attempt to put a stop to the miseries entailed by the right of private war, which was called "the Truce of God." There are one or two facts connected with that movement which have not received the attention they deserve. One is the distinction between "the Peace" and "the Truce." The first object which the Councils which legislated on this subject had in view was to secure to the unarmed classes, such as clerks, monks, peasants, women, and unarmed tradesmen and their possessions, perpetual immunity from the rapine of war; the other was to secure among those who bore arms, a truce for limited periods, as from Thursday to Monday of each week, and during the more sacred seasons of the Church year, as Advent and Christmas, and Lent and Easter. Another fact is that it was in this connection that the *interdict* was put in operation by the local authorities, before it became a weapon of the Popes—as at a Council of Limoges, A.D. 1031, under Aymon, Archbishop of Bourges, where the bishops, we are told, on the advice of Odolric, Abbot of St. Martial, determined, in case the nobles refused to observe the peace, to lay a general excommunication—that is an interdict—upon their whole territory.* A third and very important fact is, that the principle of outlawry was applied to the of-

* Fleury, B. 59, Ch. 25. Robertson says that Baronius is very angry with the Councils for presuming to undertake such business without the Pope's sanction. My idea is that the Popes learnt this from these Councils.

fenders against the public peace, and that the commons or *communes* first answered to a levy *en masse* against them. About the year 1000, William, Duke of Aquitaine, assembled a Council at Poitiers, which pledged the bishops and lords not only to keep the peace and to do justice to those who complained to them, but also to unite the community in making reprisals upon any one who should break his pledge or violate the public peace.* This compact led to the formation of associations for this purpose ; and the editor of Ordericus Vitalis mentions an author who has traced the history of such an association in the province of Berri for three centuries. He tells us also, that Aymon of Bourges, mentioned above, about the year 1038 "summoned the bishops of his province, and with the concurrence and support of his suffragans, promulgated a decree binding all persons of the age of fifteen years and upwards heartily to resist all violators of the common compact, and so far from submitting to have their property plundered to rise in arms, if occasion required, against the marauders. Not even the ministers of religion were exempted, but taking the banners from the sanctuary of the Lord, they were to join the rest of the population and have them borne against the violators of the sworn peace."† The editor of Ordericus, remarking that his author on several occasions

* Fleury, B. 58, Ch. 14.

† Ordericus Vitalis, Vol. IV., p. 52, Bohn's Edition.

speaks of levies *en masse* of the population, summoned to arms by the *curés*, and marching to battle under the banners of their respective parishes, points out that these movements were in truth crusades directed by the clergy against the disturbers of the public peace, and the natural results of the enactment of what was called *The Truce of God.* Their importance increased so that King Louis the Fat about 1108 summoned them to aid him against the rebellious nobles ; and it is from this movement that the influence of the people in the body politic takes its rise.*

* Ordericus Vitalis, B. XI., Ch. 34. Several forms of the enactment of the Truce of God in the time of Odilo of Clugny and Hildebrand are given by Peter De Marca, De Concordia Sacerdotii et Imperii, at the end of B. IV., Ch. 14; but its nature can be most conveniently illustrated by the following from a Council of Rouen, A.D. 1096, after Urban II. had made it universal at the Council of Clermont:

"1.—The holy synod (of Rouen) has decreed that the truce of God shall be strictly observed from the Sunday before the beginning of Lent to sunrise on Monday after the octave of Whitsuntide: also from Wednesday before Advent at sunset to the octave of the Epiphany, as well as every week in the year from sunset on Wednesday to sunrise on Monday; also on all feasts of St. Mary and their vigils, and all feasts of the apostles and their vigils; so that no one shall assault, or wound, or slay another, or take pledge or booty.

"2.—It is also decreed that all churches and churchyards, monks and nuns as well as females, pilgrims and merchants, with their servants, oxen and horses at plough, and men driving carts, or harrowing, and horses harrowing, and men flying for refuge to carts, and all the lands of the saints and the money of the clergy shall be forever unmolested, so that no one shall presume to assault, take, rob or injure them in any manner or at any time whatever.

"3.—It is also decreed that all persons, from the age of twelve years and upwards, shall swear to observe faithfully this institution of the truce of God as it is here appointed, by the oath following: You N. hear this: I swear that henceforth I will faithfully observe this appointment of the

Now remembering that from the year 1041, Odilo of Clugny, with the others, was much interested in promoting the observance of the Truce of God, and so curtailing the license of the military power, and that we have documents which show that he was recommending it in Italy, as well as in France, I think, as I said, that this movement influenced Hildebrand's theory of the Papacy, and gave him the idea of subjecting the military power altogether to the Church. In fact it is not improbable that ideas of a reformation of the Papacy on the Hildebrandine lines had begun to form themselves in the monasteries, before Henry III. took the matter in hand, and that Gregory VI. was put forward in that interest. A recent and voluminous biographe of Hildebrand has the theory that Gregory VI. was used as an instrument by the association formed by William of Aquitaine, above mentioned, with which Odilo was connected, and was supplied by them with the funds to buy off Benedict IX.* I confess that in view of all the circumstances this looks to me very likely. Certain it is that the monastic party took great interest in Gregory VI., and that Hildebrand, after being a monk at Clugny, became chaplain to Gregory,

truce of God as it is here expressed, and will aid my bishop or archdeacon against all persons who shall neglect to take this oath or fail to observe this decree: so that if I am summoned by them against the offenders, I will neither abscond nor conceal myself, but will attend them armed, and support them in all things to the utmost of my power, in good faith, without subterfuge and according to my conscience."

*See Robertson Ch. History, Vol. II. (8vo), p. 445 margin, note S.

and adhered to him till his death; and it is not impossible that he had been sent to Rome to guide his simplicity. When we remember the part that the charge of simony played in the policy of Hildebrand, as a weapon of offence against the clergy of the national Churches, it is hard to see how he could have attached himself so firmly to Gregory VI., who notoriously bought the Papacy, unless there had been some connection of that sort. But Hildebrand, being a profound politician, was not over scrupulous in availing himself of the means to carry out his designs.

The moral regeneration of the Papacy is not to be credited to Hildebrand. The credit of it belongs rightly to the Emperor Henry III., who in the year 1046 deposed both Benedict IX. and Gregory VI., and put Clement II. in their place. Henry was a deeply religious and conscientious man, honestly determined to root out simony from the Church, and using his power to promote the best men he could find to the ecclesiastical dignities of the Empire. When he went to Rome after the deposition of Gregory, and inquired who among the Roman clergy was fit to be Pope, he was answered, "not one." He therefore advanced Suidger, Bishop of Bamberg, to the Papal chair. Between Gregory VI. and Gregory VII., seven Popes intervened, six of whom were Germans. The seventh was a Lombard, and so the Papacy returned to Italy. The first of these Popes, Clement II. (Suidger), died in about a year; the second, Damasus II., a few days after his election. The third,

Leo IX., reigned seven years, and with him the Hildebrandine period properly begins.

Bruno, Bishop of Toul, who became Pope as Leo IX., was a man of noble birth, of liberal culture, and of fervent piety, and was chosen by Henry for these reasons. On his way to Rome, it is said, he was met at Besancon by the abbot of Clugny, in company with Hildebrand, who persuaded him to lay aside the character of Pope-elect, and to appear in Rome as a pilgrim, taking his right to the Papacy from the election of the Roman Church, and not from the imperial nomination. Hildebrand now returned to Rome, and entered again into the service of the Pope. Leo magnified his office by making journeys into Germany and France, and holding councils against simony and the "concubinage" of the clergy, and conferring privileges and immunities upon the influential monasteries. At his death the foundation was laid for the Hildebrandine superstructure. He was succeeded by Gebhard, Bishop of Eichstedt, who was nominated by the Emperor at the suggestion of Hildebrand, taking the name of Victor II. He introduced the practice of sending legates to hold councils in the various countries. Then Frederick of Lorraine became Pope as Stephen IX. After him came Gerard, Bishop of Florence, who was a Burgundian by birth, as Nicholas II. Then Anselm of Lucca was elected Pope as Alexander II. And then Hildebrand (1073) ascended the Papal throne as Gregory VII. What is to be noted is, that these Germans of high

moral and religious character, although, when advanced to the Papacy, they adopted the Hildebrandine principles, were the product of the German Church; they had been trained in it, and not in the school of the Papacy; they are therefore evidences of the spiritual life that was in the German Church while the Papacy was sunk so low. The Cluniac influence, again, was German or French; and it was this new infusion of blood from the north of the Alps, which started the Papacy on its way to the supremacy it attained in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.

The political event which accrued most to the benefit of the see of Rome at this time was the establishment of the Normans in southern Italy. From the time that Rollo became the "man" of Charles the Simple, and received the investiture of Normandy, the Normans had made rapid progress in the civilization of the age, and by this time had developed into the most hardy, warlike, astute and unscrupulous race in Europe. The Duchy of Normandy was the most powerful and prosperous fief of the French Kingdom. In the early part of the eleventh century some Norman pilgrims found their way into southern Italy. Being asked to take part in a petty war between a lord and his vassals they engaged some of their countrymen to join them; others followed, and by the time of Leo IX. they had made themselves masters of so much territory that Leo, after losing a battle against them and being taken prisoner, granted them investiture of Apulia and Calabria. As

the monks were the ecclesiastical army of the Papacy, so these Normans became its military allies. The territory in the south of Italy which they acquired was won from the Greek Empire and the Saracens, but Leo claimed the sovereignty over it by virtue of the forged donation of Constantine, and the Normans cared little whose it was, so long as they had a plausible title and the power to make it respected. They readily, therefore, became the "men" of the Papacy; and in this way the Popes obtained an army to put down the barons in the vicinity of Rome, who had tyrannized over their predecessors, and upon which they could count in any future contest with the Emperor. Their Norman vassals, however, were unruly and unscrupulous allies, who consulted their own interests in affording help to the Popes, and were a very uncertain dependence in an exigency in which there was nothing to be gained for themselves. The dependence of the Popes upon these Italian Normans was doubtless a strong inducement to Alexander II. and Gregory VII. to be complaisant to the French Norman, William the Conqueror, in abetting his usurpation of the English crown.

With these powers at his back, and with a high sense of the supreme authority of the see of St. Peter over all other earthly powers, spiritual and temporal, the monk Hildebrand, first as a servant of the Papacy, and then as Pope himself, set himself with a vigor, a persistency, an ability and a pitilessness almost unexampled, to reduce the Church and the world to the Papal obedi-

ence. The narrative of events may be read in any of the histories, and it is not necessary for me to summarize it. The line of Hildebrandine Popes lasted ,as I said, from Leo IX. (acceded 1048) to Boniface VIII. (died 1303), a period of two centuries and a half. It includes, besides Leo IX., Alexander II. and Gregory VII., Urban II., the organizer of the first Crusade; Paschal II., who offered to renounce all the temporal estates of the Church, rather than permit homage to the sovereign; Calixtus II., who brought the contest about investitures to a close by a reasonable compromise; Innocent II. and Eugenius III., the friends of St. Bernard, the latter the organizer of the second Crusade; Hadrian IV., the only Englishman who became Pope, who gave Ireland to Henry II. of England; Alexander III., who compelled Henry to do penance at the shrine of Thomas à Becket, and who triumphed over Frederick Barbarossa; Innocent III., who received the homage of the base King John of England, who compelled Philip Augustus of France to submit to his sentence, and who promoted the Albigensian crusades; and Gregory IX. and Innocent IV., the implacable adversaries of the Emperor Frederick II.

The great typical event and picture of the period is Henry IV., Emperor of Germany, standing barefoot in the snow before the closed doors of Gregory's apartments in the castle of Canossa, praying for release from his excommunication. The great Emperor Henry III. was too powerful for Hildebrand to attack

him openly; but when he left his crown and sceptre to the young child who became Henry IV., and that young child, under unfaithful tutorship grew up to be a pleasure-loving, headstrong and wayward youth, burdened with the responsibilities of the Empire before maturity, experience and misfortune developed the strength of character which showed itself in his later years, Gregory's time came, and he assumed the Papacy himself. It was very easy to foment dissatisfaction among a turbulent and rapacious nobility, eager to throw off the imperial yoke, at the mistakes of the young king, who had not strength to keep them in order, and whose private life was sinful enough to expose him to the censure of the Church. When Gregory thundered his excommunication against Henry, and absolved his subjects from their allegiance, he invited the rebellion of every discontented element, he consciously threw the Empire into greater disorder, and he intentionally weakened the central authority, the support and strengthening of which was the prime necessity of the time for the progress of society. It was an easy victory of the stern, relentless, ecclesiastical politician over a king whose advisers were treacherous and whose character was as yet unformed. Henry was excommunicated; his subjects rebelled; they were successful against him and declared him deposed unless his excommunication were removed within the year. And therefore Henry went to Canossa.

Let us do justice to Hildebrand's motives. The magnificent idea of the imperial prerogative, as the vicegerency of Christ in the rule of the world—the idea acted upon by Charlemagne, and formulated anew by Frederick Barbarossa at a later period, the idea which took hold of the soul of Dante, and made him the stern Ghibelline he was—that idea had utterly broken down in practice by the time of Hildebrand. Instead of there being one Emperor, "lord of the world," the superior of all other powers, and so the representative of the divine dominion upon earth, there had been two Emperors, one at Constantinople, and one in Germany, and numerous kings entirely independent of either of them. If, therefore, there was to be one ruler, he must be the spiritual and not the temporal head of Church and State. The False Decretals, again, which were accepted as authentic canon law in all the monastic schools, whatever else they had done, had robbed the temporal government of that sacredness with which the mind of Charlemagne had invested it, and prepared the way for the usurpation of the spiritual power as residing in the Pope. And as the secular government lost its sacredness, there was danger under the existing system—in the intimate union of Church and State, in the subordination of the Church to the State, and the double character of the hierarchy as lords temporal as well as lords spiritual—that the spiritual vitality of the Church might be stifled, and Christendom become altogether worldly. There was danger, that is, so far

as man was concerned. Let us concede that Hildebrand saw this danger, and resolved to do his utmost to avert it. It did not occur to him that if the spiritual potentate assumed the supreme temporal government, and administered it by means of his spiritual vassals the hierarchy of the Church, the same secularizing influence as before would be at work upon them, and perhaps with worse results. Let us admit that he thoroughly believed in his own theory of the Papal supremacy. It was natural for those who believed in the special grace of the see of St. Peter, to attribute its degradation in the preceding age to its subjection to the secular power (that power being the brigand Counts of Tusculum), to forget that that degradation was clearly due to the want of the supreme secular power, the Empire, working in its own sphere, and to suppose that the normal action of the Papacy required an inversion of the previous order. As the feudal system with its graded ranks and subordinations developed itself, and it became more and more plain that the Emperor was not the feudal superior of all men, it was easy to dream of the supremacy of the spiritual over the temporal power—under a different system, New England Congregational pastors have had the same dream. The mind of Gregory VII. took in the idea in all its vastness. He saw the Bishop of Rome at the summit of the ascending grades of temporal lordships, as well as of the ecclesiastical hierarchy. The vicegerent of Christ upon earth must,

if he be free and supreme, be endowed with grace to discharge the immense responsibility; that he had not discharged it in the past was due to the fact that he was not free, and was not supreme. That was the theory, and Hildebrand would make it fact. The Hildebrandine movement, therefore, was intended as a reformation ; and we may admit with justice that those who worked upon that theory desired to reform the Church, and sought to accumulate power in their hands that they might reform it.

But, admitting this, it is for us to read the history of these times by the light of the ages that followed. The theory of the Hildebrandine reform was not that of the primitive constitution of the Church ; and therefore the reformation was not permanent ; it was a failure almost from the beginning, and, as time went on, a corruption infecting the whole Church. The Papacy was compelled, from its entrance on this phase of its existence, to make use of force and diplomacy, and to depend upon them rather than upon ascertained and admitted right ; it was therefore tainted with sinister methods, and these methods reacted upon the men who used them—lowered their moral tone, so that when the power was gained, the men were not worthy to wield it. It is a great mistake to attribute the progress of Europe, from the twelfth century on, to the influence of the Papacy. It is a great mistake to lump the Churches of the Middle Ages under the one title of the Roman Catholic, or Romish

Church. The Romish Church is almost the newest of the sects of Christendom ; it dates from the Council of Trent. The Churches of the nations were, it is true, in communion with the see of Rome, and in the Roman obedience ; but they were the national Churches still, and they had their part as national Churches in the movements of the times.

And if we do justice to Hildebrand and his associates, let us do justice also to the clergy of these national Churches. They were not the corrupt and unclean wretches which modern Protestantism, wrongly reading the Hildebrandine manifestoes against them, declares them to have been. The purposes of Hildebrand required him to accuse the clergy of grievous sins, that he might put them at a disadvantage in resisting the denationalization of the Churches. But when a charge of moral corruption is brought against the established order by a revolutionist or reformer, we need to ask what is his object ; we also need to ask what is his standard of judgment—what the terms he uses actually mean in this relation—what are the facts which they represent. Now the programme of Gregory VII. was a political programme. It proposed to reduce the State as well as the Church to absolute subjection to the Papacy—to make the Pope supreme lord of every earthly power, as well as the fountain of all ecclesiastical jurisdiction. And this has been the claim of all his successors—a claim which has never been abandoned. Innocent III. declared that God had ordained

the Pope, as Christ's vicar, "to have power over all nations and kingdoms, to root out and to pull down, and to destroy, and to throw down, and to build and to plant," appropriating to the Papacy the text in the first chapter of Jeremiah. "We declare, affirm, define and pronounce," said Boniface VIII., the last of the Hildebrandine Popes, in the famous bull, "*Unam Sanctam*," "that it is altogether necessary for salvation, that every human creature be subject to the Roman pontiff."

To obtain that power was the object of the Hildebrandine revolution. The attack was made upon three lines, and directed:

First, to withdraw the ecclesiastics of the national Churches from all social sympathies, from all allegiance to the nation and interest in the national life—to denationalize them, and bind them, as the Jesuits are bound to-day, only to the Church and to the Papacy.

Secondly, to take the estates of the Church virtually out of the nation, by releasing them from all contributions to the national treasury, and by freeing their holders from the obligations to which the holders of fiefs were bound as vassals of the sovereign.

And thirdly, to weaken the temporal governments, so that the internal order and external security of the nations should be dependent upon the will of the pontiff, and he should be able to use rebellion or war as the means of coercing a monarch whose obedience

was halting, or whose sins, real or imputed, called for the censure of the pontiff.

The instruments upon which Gregory relied to accomplish the denationalization of the clergy and their estates were the charges of simony and concubinage which make so great a figure in the councils of this period. Now as these charges are the foundation of the allegation, made by modern Protestant and secular historians and controversialists, that the clergy were morally corrupt and depraved at this time, I must ask your indulgence in speaking of them at greater length than seems proportionate to the scale of these lectures. I think I have shown you evidences of spiritual vitality in the national Churches when the Papacy itself was under a cloud, and that that vitality infused new life into the see of Rome. Now the real religious earnestness of the priests and people, as well as of the rulers of the nations, while it is consistent with a great deal of superstition, with a great deal of moral inconsistency and instability, is not consistent with conscious, wilful, persistent immorality on the part of the spiritual guides of the nation and the people. On the other hand, the charge of moral corruption made by the reformer or revolutionist is apt to be colored by his prejudices, and is viewed from his stand-point. We need, therefore, to ask, as I said, what the terms used actually mean, and what are the facts which they represent.

I assert then, that the modern writer who makes this charge against the clergy of this age, though he may

quote his authorities with exactness, though he will find it in the contemporary documents repeated again and again, may be entirely mistaken in understanding it. For what is the fact? Those who were engaged in this crusade of the Papacy against the national Churches and the clergy, simply took the monastic view of clerical marriage, and branded the married clergymen—would brand those of us who to-day are living in the holy estate of matrimony—with the opprobrious epithet of concubinary priests. I am aware that it is supposed to have been the law of the Church, throughout the West, as it was not in the Greek Church, that the clergy should not marry; but as a matter of fact, in this age public opinion held these canons, if there were any such, in abeyance, and accepted clerical marriage as a general and lawful fact, where the clergy were not monks. The public opinion on this matter cannot be better illustrated than by the story, as the good monk Ordericus Vitalis tells it, of the treatment of the canons of Rouen Cathedral by their bishop, after the Council of Rheims in 1119, and his evident sympathy, though he was a monk, with the married clergy. The archbishop, provoked at the reception which the decree of separation met with, sent in his retainers to drive the clergy out of the Cathedral, and I want to read you a sentence or two from Ordericus' narrative of the affair: "Then Hugh of Longueville and Ansquetil of Cropus, and some other ecclesiastics of advanced age and great piety happened to be in the Church [while the tumult

was going on], conversing together on confession and other profitable subjects, or reciting, as was their duty, the service of the hours to the praise of God. The archbishop's domestics were mad enough to fall on these priests, and treated them shamefully, and so outrageously that they hardly restrained themselves from taking their lives, though they asked for mercy on their bended knees. These old priests, being at length dismissed, made their escape from the city as soon as they could, together with their friends who had before fled, without stopping to receive the bishop's license and benediction. They carried the sorrowful tidings to their parishioners and"—Ordericus says "concubines," I take the liberty to read *wives* — "and to prove the truth of these reports exhibited the wounds and livid bruises on their persons. The archdeacons and canons and all quiet citizens were afflicted at this cruel onslaught, and compassionated with the servants of God, who had suffered such unheard of insults,"* etc. It is the tone of this passage, remembering that it was written by a monk, that I think remarkable. It is evident that neither he, nor the archdeacons, nor the citizens, nor the parishioners, thought the clergy who were thus shamefully treated to be the immoral, licentious men, that the readers of Gregory's decrees or Peter Damiani's diatribes would infer, if they took them literally. Take Robertson's account of the married

* Ordericus Vitalis, IV., 29. Bohn's Ed.

clergy of Milan,* whose excellence is vouched for in a proverb of the time, and of their persecution by Landulph, Ariald, Herlembald and the others, as the evidence of the spirit of these charges and of those who made them; and again, consider Lanfranc's refusal to promulgate Gregory's decree of 1076 against the English parish priests, and other facts of this character;† and the conclusion is that the great bulk of the clergy were not amenable to the charge as it is generally understood.

Why then were Gregory and his successors so determined to make the rule of celibacy for the clergy universal? Not merely because they viewed the relation of the sexes from the purely monastic standpoint. Hildebrand was not a fanatical reformer of the school of Peter Damiani, though he used Peter as his tool, and though the monastic orders, with their reputation for sanctity and their immense influence, were his great reliance in the war upon clerical marriage. The reason was, that the married clergy as a class were the most interested in preserving the relation of the Church to the nation as a national Church. Professor (now Bishop) Stubbs, in his little work on the early Plantagenets, points out that there were in the Middle Ages, as in other times, three classes of the clergy: those whom the kings employed in the busi-

* Robertson's Church History, B. V., Ch. I., Vol. II., p. 599, octavo ed.

† See the long note in Gieseler, Div. III., Ch. II., Sec. 65, note 4. Vol. II. of Harper's Edition, p. 395.

ness of the State; those who were above all things Churchmen, among whom would be found at this time, the staunchest adherents of the see of Rome; and those who were real saints, like Anselm. Of the first class, he speaks thus: "The kings," he says, "had taken prelates to be their ministers, and had promoted their ministers to be prelates. Bishop Roger, of Salisbury,* [for example] was not only a powerful ecclesiastic, but the royal justiciar, the head of all the courts, and the treasurer of all the money of the king. Under him was a set of clerks, who would set the fashion for one school of the clergy, secular in mind and aim and manners; often married men, so far as their right to marry can be accounted valid, canons of cathedrals, where they provided for their children and made estates for themselves; *worthy men, most of them*, the predecessors of the clerical magistrates of this day, far greater in quarter sessions and county meetings than in convocation and missionary work."† Now these may not have been the highest type of clergy—I am not concerned to argue that they were; but I do deny that they were the immoral, irreligious men, which the popular Protestant reading of this period of history assumes them to be. In a Church organized as the "one body" of which St. Paul speaks, in which "the eye cannot say to the hand, I have no need of thee, nor again, the head to the feet, I have no need of you,"

* In the reign of King Stephen, about 1140.

† Stubbs, Early Plantagenets, p. 64.

these men were useful and valuable members ; and it is an illustration of the way in which an abnormal situation may work good under peculiar circumstances, that the national life was assisted in its resistance to the Papal usurpations by a class of clergy like these, whose usefulness and merit is not to be measured by the purely ecclesiastical standard.

From the time of Charlemagne, when the clergy were almost the only persons to whom the use of the pen was easy, it had been the custom to employ the king's chaplains and the clerks of his household in those offices of the government which required accounts and records to be kept, and laws enrolled and transcribed. These clerks, it is to be remembered, though they were thus employed in secular business, were kept to their clerical character by the rule of their order requiring them to say their office daily, and to attend daily the services of the Church. Now it was natural, when an able and trusty man had earned his promotion by fidelity and ability in this service, and was allowed to retire from it, or was seen to be worthy of a higher place, that he should be given an ecclesiastical preferment more suitable to his clerical calling ; and there was this advantage in it, that having been occupied with the laws of the realm and the affairs of the government, he would take with him into his new station, the results of that training in the national laws, traditions and customs, which made him loyal to the national life. The advantage would be the same as

when, at the present day, a man who has been bred to the law, feels himself called upon to take Holy Orders ; his legal training is a help, not only to himself, but to the diocese of which he is a member. In this way there was raised up in the Church a national party which was, by habit, by inclination, and by education, able to sustain the national side in the disputes with the Papacy when they arose. Little as they might be accounted of by the stricter Churchmen of the day, from their more secular habits of life, they were of great use to the nation and the national Church ; and therefore it was that Hildebrand tried to crush them out by his double charge against them of simony and concubinage. And even if the married clergyman had not been thus closely connected with the court, there was the same motive for putting him down. Lord Bacon somewhere remarks that "he who hath a wife and children hath given hostages unto fortune." The man who has a family is interested, not only in his own material welfare, and in the support of his family, but in the good order of society, in the well-being of his country, in all those interests which secure stability for the future, as well as peace in the present. He desires that his children shall live after him, and that they shall enjoy such prosperity as may come to them, in the order of Divine Providence, through the laws of society preserving to them the material results of their energy, intelligence and industry. He endeavors to take security for their welfare by such provision as he him-

self can make for them ; and with this in view, if he be a wise and thoughtful man, he acts in the political sphere with a wise conservatism, endeavoring to keep the course of affairs in its natural channel ; he is patriotic by instinct and forethought both ; he is devoted to his country, because it is the defender and safeguard of his hearth and home. Now this was precisely what Hildebrand did not want the priest of the Church to be. He desired to break all these ties of family and country which would interfere with an absolute devotion to the Papacy. The priest must have no secular interests but those of the Church ; he must have no associations but those of his own order ; the clergy must be a body apart from all sympathies, affections, duties, except those which appertained to their profession ; they must be united in solid phalanx with each other, and separate from all other ties whatsoever. The offence was that the Churches of the nations were national Churches, and they must be denationalized, if they were to be subjected to the Papacy, and instruments in its hands to enforce its decrees.

The second object of Gregory's policy, therefore, was to withdraw the estates and property of the Church from all obligations to the secular government. The charge of simony went hand in hand with the charge of licentiousness, and with the same motive. It was intended to weaken the national Church by involving its rulers in the guilt of an imputed sin, to weaken the national government by breaking the allegiance of the

clerical subject to his sovereign, and to reduce both Church and State to subjection to the Bishop of Rome. Simony is the sin of endeavoring to purchase the gifts of the Holy Spirit for material considerations. That is its technical meaning. But the imputation of the guilt of this sin at this time by the Papal revolutionists, and its subsequent passing into the contest of investitures, is not of itself sufficient evidence that the national Churches of Europe were tainted with it to the extent that the contemporary documents, if not duly considered, would imply. Here again I say, as I said about clerical marriage, the modern Protestant writer may quote his authorities correctly, and yet be mistaken. Many considerations must be taken into account to have an appreciative sense of the mission and work of the Mediæval Churches and of their faithfulness to their trust. If any prelate were guilty of simony in the real sense, one would think it was Gregory VI., and yet with ostentatious indifference to the charge in this case, Hildebrand, by assuming the title of Gregory VII., asserted his legitimacy, as well as proclaimed his hostility to the Emperor by whom he had been deposed.

Undoubtedly there was corrupt bargaining for the emoluments of sacerdotal office at this period, and before as well as after; but the scope of the charge, as made by the Hildebrandines included more than this, and mixed up with what was corrupt, that which was right and lawful and necessary in those times. The prelates of the Church were temporal rulers over their estates,

as well as spiritual shepherds of the flock; they had come into this responsibility, as I have shown, through the natural changes in society; they stood in this respect on the same footing with the secular nobles. To strengthen the central authority, and to preserve order, it was the policy as well as the piety of the Emperors, to balance the power of the military nobles by interposing among them the ecclesiastical principalities, "to break the impulse of aggressive warfare, to serve as models of good order, and to maintain a direct hold in the imperial hands on territories which could not become hereditary in a succession of priests."* There is no doubt whatever that the people of the ecclesiastical lordships were at this time better governed and more mercifully dealt with than the inhabitants of the lay fiefs; and therefore, however foreign to our usage under changed conditions, may be this union of sacred and secular authority, it was at that time to the great advantage of all concerned. But this being so, it was of the greatest importance, not only to the Emperor but to the Empire, not only to the King but to the Kingdom, that the administrator of this vast trust, spiritual as well as temporal, should be a man who was loyal to the supreme temporal authority, and one upon whom it could rely as wise in counsel, energetic in action, and well versed in the administration of affairs. In his temporal character, therefore, as lord of the

*Stubbs, Early Plantagenets, p. 7.

episcopal or abbatial domains, the bishop or abbot was a feudatory of the Empire or Kingdom, and as such must do homage for his fief, must promise loyalty to his superior, must pledge the customary aids which are now provided for by universal taxation. His obligation of loyalty depending upon the oath of allegiance, without which he was not the "man" of his lord—his homage being necessary to bind him to the obligation—the Emperor or King must require that homage and oath of allegiance; and he must also exercise that right of investiture by which his authority over the fief and its holder was witnessed and kept valid. And all this being so, the right of nomination to such a fief, the right of choice to whom so great a trust was to be committed, would naturally be felt to be the royal or imperial prerogative. The Emperor or King, therefore, acquired in this way the nomination of the bishops and great abbots, and although, as we have seen, in earlier times they bestowed the fiefs sometimes upon laymen who performed the spiritual duties by proxy, yet at the time we are speaking of, that was a thing of the past, and ecclesiastics who had their confidence were appointed. Now it was to be said with truth, that the sovereign was interested to appoint good men and able men, rather than bad or weak men, to high ecclesiastical office, and that the appointing power was safer in his hands than in any other,* for the reason that the

*After the right of election had been secured to the Chapters by the Concordat of Worms "Frederick Barbarossa had probably good reason

appointment of a bishop or great abbot was an affair of State ; it would not be made without advice ; the King's counsellors would have a part in the decision ; it would be pondered and considered, and the effort would be to make a wise and creditable choice.*

for declaring in a well-known speech that the bishops appointed by the imperial power had been better than those the clergy chose for themselves."—Robertson, III., 218.

* Take the following example from Maitland, *Dark Ages*, p. 128 sq. The see of Paderborn became vacant in 1009. Nine years before, the city, monastery and cathedral had been destroyed by fire, and the see was reduced to such wretched poverty, that it was difficult to know how to fill the vacancy. "The Emperor, having, however, convened such bishops and princes as attended him at Geslar, consulted with them as to the appointment of a bishop who should be most suited to the circumstances of time and place. After long deliberation, and canvassing the merits of a good many persons, all agreed that Meinwerc was the fittest man. * * * The Emperor (faventibus et congratulantibus omnibus) sent for the chaplain; and, when he came, smiling with his usual kindness, he held out a glove, and said—'Take this.' Meinwerc, who can hardly be supposed to have been ignorant of what was going on, and who understood the nature of the symbol, inquired what he was to take. 'The see of Paderborn,' replied the Emperor. The chaplain, with all the freedom of a kinsman and old schoolfellow, asked his royal master how he could suppose that he wished for such a bishopric, when he had property enough of his own to endow a better. The Emperor, with equal frankness, replied that that was just the very thing he was thinking of, that his reason for selecting him was that he might take pity on that desolate Church, and help it in its need. 'Well then,' said Meinwerc heartily, 'I will take it on these terms.' * * * * 'Being therefore,' says his biographer, 'raised to the episcopal office, he constantly watched over the flock committed to him; and fearing lest he should incur the reproach of the slothful servant, who hid his lord's money in a napkin, he did nothing remissly. * * *' He immediately made over his hereditary property to the see; and on the third day after his arrival he pulled down the mean beginnings of a cathedral, which his predecessors had built up, and erected one at great expense and with singular magnificence. His personal attention to the work, and his

At the same time there was this difficulty, that the wretched fiscal system of the Middle Ages left the sovereign always without adequate means to meet the expenditure necessary for the royal state and the needs of the kingdom; and therefore there was the temptation to make terms with the nominee for as large a share of the revenues of the ecclesiastical domain as could be reserved by the crown. I do not understand the royal finance of this period, but it is plain that the sovereign, considering his needs, was always poor; every fief granted was so much taken away from the royal domain, which therefore constantly suffered dilapidation, while the estates of the Church suffered none; the prince, therefore, must make the ecclesiastical domain assist in his relief, which was for the public and national service. There was, then, occasion for the charge of simony, as made by the Hildebrandine party, and sufficient plausibility in it to make the contest of investitures a bitter one. But Gregory and his successors not only mixed up these two things which are distinct, but they struck a blow at the very life of the nations. By denying the right of the sovereign to require homage and to grant investiture of the temporalities on the oath of allegiance, subjecting the ecclesiastic thereby to the performance of his duties to the

kindness to the workmen, made the building go on rapidly; and he did not fail to call upon the Emperor, who frequently came to Paderborn, and took great interest in its proceedings, for his full share of the expense."

State, they would have destroyed one-half the effective force of the nation, because the release of the lord implied the release also of his vassals. But that was not all. Had the demand been complied with, the Pope would have become the feudal superior of the denationalized clergy; the dues and service of which the State had been deprived would have been claimed by him; and the danger of an ecclesiastical crusade as against an insubordinate sovereign would have been very real. The sovereign, therefore, could not abandon this right, except upon the terms agreed upon by Paschal II. and Henry V., that the clergy should renounce all their temporal possessions; an agreement which the clergy, as the party to be despoiled, naturally refused to ratify. The contest lasted for fifty years, and was finally settled by the Concordat of Worms, between Calixtus II. and Henry V. (A.D. 1122); the substantial victory remaining with the Emperor, who yielded the use of the pastoral ring and staff as symbols of investiture, but retained the right itself, and received the homage of the bishop-elect, and held him to the performance of his duties to the Empire as well as to the Church.

In endeavoring to secure the universal celibacy of the clergy, and their freedom from the service of the State, it might appear that the Papal party were actuated by the high moral principle which demanded a stricter and more severe life on the part of the ecclesiastical body. As a matter of fact, the clergy, and the Popes

themselves were more engaged in secular matters than before. It could not be otherwise, when the third object on the Hildebrandine programme was the subjection of the temporal government itself to the Papacy —the reduction of the Empire or Kingdom itself to the condition of a fief held by the Holy See. That might seem to the zealous Churchmen to be also for the interest of religion and morality; but it was not the divine order—in which the Church and the State have each in its sphere co-ordinate authority, received directly from God; and we shall see in the next lecture how the national spirit was roused to prevent it. You remember Gregory's demand of William the Conqueror that he should do fealty for his new Kingdom of England, and William's stern reply: "I refused to do fealty, nor will I do it, because neither have I promised it, nor have my predecessors done it to yours." William was as great and strong a man as Gregory VII., and Gregory was afraid of him, and let him take his own way. But if a sovereign were in difficulties the Papacy immediately became aggressive. The doctrine was now advanced that the excommunication of a sovereign by the Pope absolved all his subjects from their allegiance—or that it authorized the Pope to declare them absolved from their allegiance. The excommunicated sovereign was to be shunned by all his vassals, all his retainers, all his servants. They who remained faithful to him were held to be involved in his guilt and liable to the same sentence. If he were contumacious,

it was the duty of his vassals to make war upon him, to dethrone him, to aid and abet his enemies.* In other words, the instrument on which the Pope relied to coerce his refractory son was *treason* and *rebellion.* The effect of this doctrine was to make rebellion profitable if it succeeded, and without harm to the rebel if it failed. Now in the feudal period, when the chief serious occupation of the nobles and their retainers was war—when they were purely a military aristocracy, who, in default of a patriotic war, carried on private feuds with each other, and were incited thereto by the hope of plunder, as well as by the desire for revenge—to add another to the motives for the appeal to arms was, in my poor opinion, one of the greatest political crimes that a wise and thoughtful man could commit. When parties took sides in such a quarrel as that between Gregory VII. and Henry IV., the effect of this doctrine must be—was intended to be—to expose the dominions of the king and his defenceless people to the miseries of civil war, aggravated by the impunity guaranteed to the rebellious party by the Pope. For if the rebellious party, fighting under the license of the Pope, were successful, the plunder of the loyal nobles and of the king would be their reward; whereas, if the king were victorious, the penalties of treason could not be enacted,

* Notice that all this is the extension of the ideas involved in the movement of the "Truce of God" of which I have spoken above. When thus applied to the sovereign it was pernicious in the extreme, because it destroyed the autonomy of the nation.

because the Papal ægis would be held over them, and their pardon be insisted upon as the condition of reconciliation with the Church. The turbulent nobles who chafed under the restraints of the royal authority would be eager to rebel, if they could thus do it with safety; and thus the Papacy, instead of being the conservator of public order, as is claimed for it by its advocates, was, it seems to me, the one great obstacle to the progress of Europe in the ages of its domination. Add to this the stirring up of kingdom against kingdom, and the invention of the interdict to punish a people who would not rebel, and the mischief done by the Papacy is incalculable, and is not to be offset by the erection of the Papal curia as a tribunal of last resort.

In one respect the Papacy was an advantage to Western Christendom in that transition period when the nations were awaking to new life. It preserved the idea of the unity of the Church, as greater than the nation; and it operated to some extent to arrest the secularization of the clerical body. It gave the greater men larger ideas and wider interests; it assisted in the organization of the commonwealth of nations. But further than that it cannot be said that the programme of Gregory VII. succeeded. The Popes succeeded in getting it accepted as canon law that the clergy should not marry; but their own lawyers invented evasions, and that which, but for such laws and evasions, would have been the honorable estate which

it is among us, became the scandal of the later Middle Ages. They succeeded in modifying the relation of the ecclesiastics to the temporal power, and in attaching to the Roman see a type of Churchmen like Thomas à Becket, but not of clear-sighted, honest men like Lanfranc. They did not succeed in denationalizing the clerical order, although they paralyzed the impulse towards internal reform in the national Churches, by requiring all things to be referred to Rome for confirmation. They succeeded in stirring up rebellions here and there, as against Henry II. and Frederick II. of Germany, or in taking advantage of the national discontent at misrule, as in the case of King John of England; but they could not dispose of thrones and sceptres at their will. Rudolph of Suabia was not successful in holding the Empire against Henry, nor Otho of Saxony against Frederick, and there were more anti-popes than rival Kings or Emperors.* No Emperor after Henry IV. was dethroned because of their anathemas; the gradual weakening of the imperial power was due to political causes internal to Germany, and to the incompatibility of Germany and Italy. As mediators between the sovereigns of different nations they exerted an influence sometimes beneficial; and sometimes their influence was hurtful by stirring up war for their own purposes; but they did not succeed in establishing an effective control or suzerainty over

*Between Leo IX. and Innocent III., twelve anti-popes were set up.

any but the smaller and insignificant kingdoms. They could avail themselves of the difficulties or false steps of a great ruler like Frederick Barbarossa, or Henry Plantagenet, to gain an apparent triumph; but they could not obtain any real advantage over them. In extending their authority over the Western Church, while they made themselves the ultimate court of appeal in all causes, they depraved the canon law by inserting in it the False Decretals, and they were very generally charged with giving judgment in favor of the longest purse. The great movements of the Crusades, in which their influence is most apparent, were gigantic failures as regards the end sought to be attained. The first only was successful; while the ultimate results were destructive of the political influence of the Papacy. The conquest of Constantinople by the soldiers of the Third Crusade, and the establishment of the Latin Empire of the East, did not reduce the Greeks to the Papal obedience; and the dominion of the Latins was short-lived. There was, in the traditions and feelings of rulers and people in the various nations and national Churches, an effective barrier against the Hildebrandine assumptions which the Popes were never able to surmount. When Frederick Barbarossa called in the Italian lawyers to declare his rights as Emperor according to the Code of Justinian; when the English barons, under the leadership of their patriotic archbishop Stephen Langton, affirmed the validity of Magna Charta against Innocent III. as well as against

King John; when Philip Augustus refused to do homage for certain lands held of the Church, on the ground that the King must not do homage to any one; and when his grandson, the sainted Louis IX., issued his Pragmatic Sanction as the bulwark of the liberties of the Gallican Church, the death-knell of the Papal theory of Gregory VII. was sounded. The Papacy as formulated by that theory does not exist, and never has existed. The Popes hold to it, and make the extravagant claims based upon it; but the Catholic Church has never accepted it; and the nations and national Churches of "the Roman obedience" have been obedient with extensive reservations.

Even where the Popes seemed to be most successful, an analysis of the political situation shows that their success was due, less to the inherent strength of the Papacy, than to the separate designs and objects of those who co-operated with them. Next to the penance of Henry IV. at Canossa, the most striking demonstration of the Papal supremacy in the Middle Ages was the reconciliation of Frederick Barbarossa with Alexander III. at Venice, on the 24th of July, 1177. The great Emperor prostrated himself at the feet of the Pope, and paid him the respect of holding his stirrup and bridle as he mounted his palfrey. By thus submitting himself, Frederick brought to an end a strife of more than twenty years. But the Treaty of Venice, though it brought peace, settled nothing, so far as the Pope was concerned, except the acknowl-

edgment of his title as Pope, and the renunciation of the anti-pope. The advantages gained were gained by the Italian cities, which had been the allies of the Pope, not for his sake, but to secure their own liberties. These cities, while Italy was neglected by preceding Emperors, had become prosperous by industry and commerce, and had learned in the school of necessity to defend themselves against the disorderly nobles of their vicinity, as well as against barbarian enemies; they had therefore formed themselves into republics on the model of the ancient commonwealths of classical antiquity. Italian republicanism, however, was not the enlightened and expansive love of country which animates the patriotic citizen of the United States; it confined its love of liberty within the walls of its own city, and was quite willing to subjugate and oppress its neighbors. The country, meantime, was in the hands of the old families as nobles and proprietors, and these were not on good terms with the cities, whose liberties they grudged, and whose tradesmen they despised. When Frederick, therefore, made his first appearance as Emperor in Italy, and summoned his vassals to the Imperial Diet on the plains of Roncaglia, he was met with complaints of some of the smaller towns against the larger, especially against Milan, and he proceeded to do justice upon the offenders. Frederick Barbarossa was above all things a just man. He was always ready to concede to every one his undoubted rights; but he was also determined to make his own respected. He

was strenuous in asserting that he held the Imperial Crown of God alone; he knew very well that the Papal claims were novelties and encroachments upon his prerogative; the Empire, as a divine trust committed to him was the "Holy Roman Empire," and its dignity and power must suffer no diminution in his hands. He was resolute, therefore, to resume those imperial rights which some of his predecessors had weakly suffered to fall into abeyance. At the same time he had a reverent respect for all law enacted by the recognized authority in Church or State, and he was willing that his authority should be so ascertained; but he would submit to no usurpation, and tolerate no rebellion. When he was in Germany, he governed according to the known customs and laws of the German Kingdom; when he went to Italy, he summoned the Italian lawyers to declare what were the imperial rights in Italy, and what were the legally recognized rights and franchises of the Italian cities. The lawyers expounded to him the Code of Justinian, and informed him that by the civil law his power as Emperor was autocratic; and the investigation into the status of the cities showed him that they had assumed to exercise certain "regalia" without authority. Frederick, therefore, was justified in proceeding against the offenders; but his conception of his prerogative was totally opposed, not only to the Papal theory of Hildebrand, but to the nascent republicanism and independent feeling of the cities. A conflict, therefore, was inevitable. It was embittered, not only by the Em-

peror's persuasion that he was dealing with rebels, but by the jealousy of the Italian cities against each other, which caused them to take sides as imperialists and anti-imperialists or, in other words as Ghibelline and Guelph; and by the active intervention of the Pope, who was determined by every means in his power to destroy the imperial authority in Italy. The war lasted for twenty years; Frederick set up an anti-pope, and destroyed city after city; but after the final defeat of his army at Legnano, he became convinced that his position was untenable, and like the great and magnanimous man he was, he made a just and honorable peace, rendering to the Pope the outward respect which custom sanctioned as due to the spiritual head of the Church, and in 1183, by the Treaty of Constance, securing to the cities of Lombardy such franchises and privileges as they had fairly won—a treaty which he and his descendants faithfully observed. Although defeated, Frederick's dignity suffered no diminution, and when in 1184 he made his last expedition into Italy to marry his son Henry to Constance, the heiress of Sicily, the Lombard cities welcomed him enthusiastically, and vied with one another in doing him honor.

The other great triumph of the Papacy, the destruction of the House of Hohenstauffen—the long war with Frederick the Second, and the calling in of Charles of Anjou to wrest the Kingdom of Sicily from Manfred and Conradin—though it is made use of by historians of a certain class, to point the moral of the vanity of

earthly greatness in conflict with the spiritual power, was in reality the beginning of the downfall of the Papacy itself. The indignation of Europe was aroused at the treatment of an able and enlightened ruler as Frederick was, by Gregory IX. and Innocent IV.—at the implacable hatred displayed by them, and their manifest determination that under no circumstances should Frederick be justified in what he did, or what he left undone. Its patience was exhausted at the shameless demands of money to carry on the crusade against him; and the vile traffic in sacred things to obtain the money. And the success of Charles of Anjou was the means of making the Papacy, in the person of Martin IV., the obsequious servant of that usurper, and of preparing the way for that influence of France in the sacred college, which resulted in the transfer of the Papacy to Avignon, and the so-called "Babylonish Captivity" of the Popes. But I cannot enlarge upon that in this lecture; I shall have something to say upon it in the next; and in the meantime any history of this period will give you the facts.

A remark to be made in passing is, that the struggle between Pope and Emperor for influence in Italy, had one result in that country which was peculiar to it. I shall have occasion in the next lecture to point out that the rise of the people to political influence, and their interest in the integrity and peace of the nation made them espouse the cause of King against Pope, and so curtailed the political power of the Papacy. In Italy it

was different. The fact that the Italian cities were contending against a foreign sovereign in the person of Barbarossa, and that this foreign sovereign was a feudal chief in Germany, attended by his aristocracy, and served by Italian nobles, and that the Popes sustained the cities in their struggle against the Emperor, made, on the whole, the conflict of Guelph against Ghibelline, a conflict of the democracy against the aristocracy. There were many exceptions to this. The jealousy and hostility of city against city made one city Ghibelline because another city was Guelph; and then the spirit of faction within the city, made one party Guelph because the other party was Ghibelline, and the nobles in like manner took their sides; but nevertheless, on the whole, as I said, at this time, the more democratic party was Guelph, and the more aristocratic party was Ghibelline. Later it was not so; as Italy sunk under the effects of the Papal policy into a chaotic state, and all national aspirations died out, the parties perpetuated themselves as personal animosities, and had no religious or political meaning. But this was the condition at this time. And in this, Italy was alone. In the other countries the people sided with their kings. Do not make the mistake, therefore, of supposing that the strength of the Papacy lay in its espousing the cause of the people, for it never did that with any sincerity. Even in Gregory VII.'s time, the cities of Germany sided with Henry IV.

But even in Italy, there was one city in which neither the democratic nor the aristocratic element could be depended upon for loyalty to the Popes, and that was their own city of Rome. Most remarkable, in view of their pretensions at this time, was the relation of the Popes to that city whence they took their title, to that see whence they were supposed to derive their sanctity, and to those people who were above all others their especial charge. I have been at the pains to make from Robertson and others a synopsis of their frequent expulsions from Rome, and print it here for those who may wish to see it. Beginning with Gregory VII.: he retired from Rome under the hatred aroused against him because of the devastation of the city by Robert Guiscard, whom he called in to resist Henry IV., and died at Salerno, with words upon his lips " which have been interpreted as a reproach against Providence, but which may perhaps rather imply a claim to the beatitude of the persecuted: 'I have loved righteousness and hated iniquity, and therefore I die in exile.'" His successor, Victor III., was conducted to Rome by a Norman force, but he soon left it, and died at Monte Casino. Urban II., elected in 1088, did not obtain undisputed possession of Rome until eleven years after, and in that year he died. His successor, Paschal II., having left the city on the approach of Henry V. of Germany, in 1117, the citizens refused to permit his return after Henry's departure, and he was able to get possession only of the castle of St. Angelo, where he

died. He was succeeded by Gelasius II., who, in his short pontificate of one year, was twice brutally assaulted by one of the nobles of his flock, and twice driven out of the city. He died in the abbey of Clugny. Calixtus II., who came next, was elected at Clugny, and consecrated at Vienne ; he remained in France for two years, and then obtained possession of Rome, where he exerted himself vigorously to put down lawlessness. On his death Theobald was elected, but was frightened out of the Papal chair by Robert Frangipani, a powerful noble, who made Honorius II. Pope. When he died, the rival factions set up Anacletus II. and Innocent II. Innocent is reckoned the legitimate Pope, but Anacletus held the city of Rome, and Innocent went to France. He was brought home by the Emperor Lothair, but was expelled on his departure, and restored again in 1137. Two years after this he was taken prisoner by Roger of Sicily, who compelled him to acknowledge his title of king, which had been given him by the anti-pope. Meantime the Romans, under the influence of Arnold of Brescia, renounced their allegiance to him, and set up a republic. Celestine II., his successor, was a friend of Arnold, and reigned peaceably the six months of his pontificate. The next Pope, Lucius II., attempting to put down the republic by force, was killed by the mob.* Eugenius

* "To have slain a Pope afflicted the Romans with no remorse. The Papal party felt no shame at the unseemly death of a Pope who had fallen in actual war for the defence of his temporal power ; republican Rome felt no compunction at the fall of her enemy."—Milman, IV., 243.

III. followed ; he was a monk of Clairvaux and a friend of St. Bernard ; he surprised every one by his capacity after being made Pope ; but he could not get along with the Romans. He was consecrated at Farfa, about twenty miles north of Rome. The Romans under Arnold of Brescia "proceeded to reorganize their domestic policy on the basis of the total exclusion of the Pope from all share in the civil government. * * * This resolution was practically confirmed by the plunder and demolition of the pontifical palaces, those of the fugitive cardinals, the castellated dwellings of the Papal nobili, and the obliteration of every vestige of pontifical state and government."* Eugenius made war upon the city, and was enabled to celebrate the Christmas of 1145 within 'ts walls ; but the next April he was compelled to leave, and retired beyond the Alps, where he and St. Bernard organized the Second Crusade. In 1149 he returned under the protection of the King of Sicily, but the Romans again expelled him. They allowed him to come back in 1153, and he died in the city in July of that year. Anastasius IV. was Pope for a year and five months, and then Adrian IV. for four years. Under the protection of Frederick Barbarossa, he put down the republic and hung Arnold of Brescia ; but after crowning the Emperor he was compelled to leave Rome, and died at Anagni. On his death the Sicilian party in the Roman Church set

* Greenwood, Cathedra Petri, V., 44.

up Alexander III. and the Imperialist, Victor IV. Alexander is counted the Pope, Victor the anti-pope; each was consecrated out of Rome. Alexander resided at Anagni till 1161, when he withdrew to France. He came to Rome in December, 1165, and was enthusiastically received; but was driven out by Barbarossa in 1167, and did not return again until after his reconciliation with the Emperor at Venice. In 1179 he held a great Council (Third of Lateran), and among other things decreed that the election of Pope should rest exclusively in the College of Cardinals. He then retired from Rome, and died at Civita Castellana in 1185. On the election of Lucius III. by the cardinals only, under the constitution of Alexander, the Romans, indignant at being deprived of their share in the election, rose against the Pope and expelled him, and he was never able to obtain a secure footing in the city. Urban III. succeeded him; he seems never to have set foot in Rome as Pope. The next was Gregory VIII.; he reigned only one month and twenty-one days, and did not enter the city. Then came Clement III.; he made a treaty with the Romans by which he consented to deliver up the cities of Tusculum and Tibur to their vengeance, as the price of their consent to receive him. After him came Celestine III., and then Innocent III., who was able to hold the Romans in check.

Of the Popes who followed Innocent, Gregory IX. was driven out by the Romans in Eastertide 1228, because he had excommunicated the Emperor Fred-

erick II.; in two years his subjects invited him back, but the year after he had to appeal to the Emperor for assistance against them, which was refused, and he retired from the city. In 1232 he returned, but was again expelled in 1234, and was restored by Frederick during an interval of peace between Emperor and Pope. His successor Innocent IV. fled from Rome at the approach of Frederick, and retired to Lyons in 1244; he sought invitations to visit the Kingdoms of France, England and Spain, but the sovereigns of these countries declined the honor. On the death of Frederick he went to Italy, but showed no disposition to return to Rome until the senator Brancaleone sternly reminded him that he was bishop of that city, and required his residence; he could not have been there long, however, as he died at Naples the same year (Dec. 7, 1254). The next Pope, Alexander IV., was compelled by the Romans, who had again set up a republic, to reside in their midst; but in 1257 they drove him out, and he died at Viterbo in 1261. After this, Viterbo became the ordinary residence of the Popes, six of whom succeeded one another with great rapidity—the cardinals adopting the policy of choosing the oldest or most infirm of their number to be Pope, to create the next vacancy the sooner. Nicholas III. (1277) transferred the Papal residence back to Rome; but Charles of Anjou's Pope, Martin IV., made his residence at Orvieto. Nicholas IV. lived at Rieta, but removed to Rome under the protection of the Colonna

family. After him there was a vacancy of two years and three months; then came Celestine V., who abdicated in a short time; and then Boniface VIII., with whom the line of Hildebrandine Popes came to an end. After him the Papacy went to Avignon.

This is certainly a startling exhibit for the time at which the Papal power was at its height. It may at least cause us to inquire whether the progress of Europe, which was very great at this time, was much affected by the Papal supremacy. The twelfth and thirteenth centuries were times of a great awakening of political and intellectual activity, of an advance in the material, moral and social condition of Europe; and that advance, being contemporary with the exaltation of the Papacy, is plausibly set forth as due to that exaltation, and made to redound to its credit. But it is very easy to show, as I shall show in the next lecture, that the awakening and advance were independent of the Papacy; and that the Papacy itself was an effect of its earlier development, and a hindrance to its later.

VI.

NATIONALISM.

VI.

NATIONALISM.

It is the greatest fallacy in the world to call the Church of Western Europe in the Middle Ages the Roman Church, or the Romish Church, or even the Roman Catholic Church. The writers of the Middle Ages themselves accurately distinguish between the Roman Church and the National Churches which were in communion with it. The English Church, for example, is the English Church in Magna Charta, and in the Statutes of Provisors and Præmunire; while the Roman Church in contemporary documents stands for the local church of the city of Rome. The National Churches, although in the period now under review, they acknowledged the primacy or supremacy of the Roman pontiff, did not acknowledge it in the same way that the Churches of the Roman obedience do now, and have done since the Council of Trent and the Creed of Pope Pius IV. Still less did they draw their spiritual vitality from that fountain. It suits the infidel or ultra-Protestant historian to make the mistake of ignoring these National Churches, and confounding them under the one name, that he may discredit the Church idea,

and make it appear that the Church failed in "the Dark Ages," notwithstanding our Saviour's promise that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it; and it suits the Romish controversialist to foster this mistake, because it enables him to claim for the Roman Church the credit of all the good that belongs to this period—of which there was a great deal. But it does not become us of the American Catholic Church to fall into the same error. The National Churches had their own traditions and lived their own spiritual life; they held the loyal adhesion of their people because they were the National Churches; and they did not begin to lose it until from the time of Innocent IV., and during the Avignon period and the Great Schism that followed it, curialism made them its prey. These Churches were worthy of the loyalty and love that were so freely given them, because (despite the superstitions and abuses popularly attributed to this period) they were honestly engaged in the endeavor to lead the people heavenward through faith in Christ, and the knowledge of the truth.

The point I make is, that the intellectual, moral and social advance of Europe in the eleventh, twelfth and thirteenth centuries was due to the religious and civilizing influence of the National Churches; that the Papacy was at most only auxiliary to them in its better period, and was distinctly oppressive and corrupting to them in its worse and later period; that the evidences of spiritual life are found in *their* spontaneous efforts; that the great moral and spiritual movements of the

period had their various centres in the National Churches of Europe; and that we must study these National Churches as well as the Papacy, if we would know the real state of Christianity in the Middle Ages.

It was natural, of course, that the ecclesiastics of high hierarchical principles, as well as some of the imaginative and enthusiastic saints, should throw themselves into the Papal movement, so far as it promised to make the hierarchy less worldly and more ascetic. But this alliance with the Papacy, this subordination and loyalty to it of good and holy men, does not prove or imply that they found in it the springs of their spiritual life. He would be greatly in error who should count St. Anselm, the first of the Schoolmen, or St. Bernard, the last of the Fathers, a Romanist of the Tridentine type, or assume that the Rome of the eleventh or twelfth century made them what they were. The truth is that both St. Anselm and St. Bernard were suspicious of the vast claims of the Papacy, and were willing to see them curtailed because they were injurious to the National Churches. It was the traditional Christianity descending to their generations in the national and local churches, which made these men what they were.

Take St. Bernard for the example. I have in the last lecture spoken of the influence of the great monastery of Clugny in the period preceding the Hildebrandine, and its connection with the reform of the Papacy. In course of time, and in consequence of the general

revival, of which the Hildebrandine movement was an effect rather than a cause, other orders of monks sprang up under rules much more severe than that of Clugny, the chief of which were the Carthusians and the Cistercians. St. Bernard is the great glory of the Cistercian order. No envy can, no calumny attempts to detract from the bright example of that great saint. His austerities may have been uncalled for and unwise; his advocacy of the Second Crusade led many brave men to destruction without any compensating benefit to Christendom; but when you get to the inner heart of the man himself, you find it filled with the pure love of God and of his fellows; you find a man whom no amount of popularity could corrupt, who was sincere, faithful, honest, Christian through and through, who was learned in the best school of Christian thought—"the last of the Fathers" they call him, because his method was the patristic, and not that of the scholastics of the next age. The wonderful personal magnetism of St. Bernard, his infectious enthusiasm, his unbounded influence over everyone who came within his reach, his immense activity, his complete abnegation of self—these were sanctified, under the rigid discipline of the Cistercian order, by the grace of God's Holy Spirit in the heart of the sincere seeker after righteousness, to make him an illustrious example of that principle of the Christian life enunciated by St. Paul: "I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me, and the life that I now live

in the flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave Himself for me."

Now St. Bernard was a zealous champion of Innocent II. in his contest with the anti-pope Anacletus, and the friend and monitor of Eugenius III., who had been one of his monks at Clairvaux; but he was not a product of Hildebrandine Romanism. He was one of those, of whom there were many in the Middle Ages, who were carefully brought up at home by a pious mother. You remember the story of his entering Citeaux with thirty followers whom he had won by his persuasiveness; among them all his brothers, except the youngest, who remained at home with his aged father—both of these joining him after a short time. As abbot of Clairvaux he became, through no other influence than his exalted piety, the oracle of Europe—more really pope than the Pope himself. He gained the allegiance of France, of England, and of Germany to Innocent II.; but when Innocent visited him at Clairvaux, the Puritan simplicity and monastic rigor of the Cistercians were so uncongenial to the Pope and his cardinals, that they had no desire to tarry long with him. As the promoter of the Second Crusade he carried away all Europe with his enthusiasm, performing the "miracle" of winning Conrad III., the Emperor of Germany, to take the cross. He is not only the friend but the instructor of Eugenius III., for whom he writes his treatise "On Consideration." But closely as he is connected with the Holy See, he stands up manfully for the rights of the National Church

and its bishops, and is not sparing of rebukes to the Pope himself.

Thus, having occasion to write to Pope Innocent on behalf of the Archbishop of Treves, he says: "I speak to you with a great deal of freedom, because I have a more than ordinary affection for you, which could not be, should I use dissimulation. The Archbishop of Treves' complaint is not his alone, but proceeds from the sentiments of several others, and chiefly those that love you best. They complain that justice is no more to be found in the Church, that the keys thereof become of no use, and the Episcopal authority is rendered despicable by reason that the bishops have now no more power to revenge the injuries done to God, nor to punish the offences committed in their dioceses. The fault of all which is laid upon you and the Court of Rome. It is affirmed that you abolish what they have well established, and that you have established what they have abolished with reason. * * * What a shame is this! What occasion for laughter to the enemies of the Church! Friends find themselves confounded, the faithful affronted, bishops become the subjects of scorn and contempt, and your authority much lessened by the weakness of your decisions."* To certain cardinals he writes in favor of an abbot whom he thinks unjustly treated: "Formerly you have been accused of domineering over the clergy and the consciences of all

* Ep. 178, Dupin, Cent. XII., p. 55.

the world, contrary to the precept of the Apostle; and now you add something to this presumption in showing an inclination to dispose absolutely of all religious persons [*i. e.* monks]; insomuch that I know not what remains for you to desire more, unless you would likewise command over the angels."* Of the proceedings of Cardinal Jordan, in the character of Papal legate, he writes: "He has passed from nation to nation, and from one kingdom to another people, everywhere leaving foul and horrible traces among us. He is said to have everywhere committed disgraceful things; to have carried off the spoils of churches, to have promoted pretty little boys to ecclesiastical honors wherever he could; and to have wished to do so where he could not. Many have bought themselves off that he might not come to them; those whom he could not visit he taxed and squeezed by means of messengers. In schools and courts and the places where roads meet, he has made himself a by-word. Seculars and religious, all speak ill of him; the poor, the monks and the clergy complain of him."† In his treatise "On Consideration," written at the request of Pope Eugenius, he speaks with like freedom: "He gives him to understand that he is not set over others to domineer over them, but to be their minister and watch over them. * * * That the same person cannot well execute the civil government

*Ep. 231, Ib., p. 58.

†Robertson, III., 216. Dupin, p. 62.

and the Papacy, and therefore he who grasps at both ought justly to lose both. * * * You are not supremely perfect by being supreme bishop, and take notice that if you think yourself so, you are the worst of men. * * * 'Tis to you that the keys of heaven have been entrusted, and to whom the care of the flock has been committed; but there are other doorkeepers of heaven and other pastors besides you." [*i.e.*, the bishops of the Church.] It is evident that even as early as this the new Papacy is felt to be hurtful to religion, since St. Bernard is very severe upon appeals, exemptions, and other interferences with the national Churches. "Everybody appeals to your Holiness; it is a badge of your primacy, yet, if you are wise, you will rather endeavor to procure the welfare of the Church, than insist upon the grandeur of your see. Men appeal to the Pope, and would to God it were to a good end. Would to God that those who oppress others would feel the effect of protection granted to those who are oppressed. But on the contrary, nothing is more common than for the oppressors to have cause to rejoice, and for the oppressed to have reason to mourn." As regards exemptions he says, "I have a mind to speak of the complaints and murmurings of the Churches, who cry continually that they are torn to pieces and dismembered, and that there are few or none but either feel this damage or fear it. If you ask, wherefore? it is because the abbeys are wrested from the jurisdiction of their bishops, the bishops from that of the archbishops, and

the archbishops from that of the patriarchs or primates. Does this consist with order? Can this be any way excused? You may thereby indeed show the absoluteness of your power, but it is to be feared you can at the same time produce but little justice. You do thus because you have the power to do it, but the question will be only whether you ought to have done it. You are set above others to preserve to every one his rank and quality, and not to injure any one." He proves afterwards that these exemptions are neither just nor profitable; that they confound the economy of the Church; that they occasion a great deal of trouble, and raise a contempt as well of the laws and powers established by God Almighty, as of those of the Pope.*

Now these are the utterances, not of a discontented or rebellious son of the Church, not of the adherent of an emperor or anti-pope, but of the greatest saint of the mediæval period; of one who was honestly devoted to the Papacy as he understood it, and highest in the confidence of the Popes. I do not quote these passages to throw discredit upon the Popes of this period; but simply to prove what I said, that Bernard was not a creature of the Papacy, but a genuine product (so far as any man with a distinct individuality can be said to be a product of his age and surroundings) of the Church of France, and of the traditional Christianity of the period.

*Dupin, Cent. XII., p. 68, 69.

That he was its most illustrious product is not to be denied; but where there was one Bernard there must have been many good Christians who made no noise in the world; and my contention is that the Church which had such sons was a living Church, Papacy or no Papacy.

The fact is that all the great religious movements of this period had their rise in the National Churches, independently of, and antecedent to, or concurrently with the Hildebrandine movement. Let me trace some of them in outline :

1.—The intellectual revival, which is so marked in the eleventh century and still more in the twelfth, and which led to the immense activity of scholasticism in the thirteenth, shows that the traditions of the age of Charlemagne had not died out in the tenth century, and that as soon as order began to be restored, the Church endeavored first to raise the standard of clerical education, and then to educate the people. Not only did Charlemagne require schools to be kept in the cathedrals and monasteries, but a capitulary of his required the bishop to call up his priests "by sections and weeks," for instruction by himself or by well-learned ministers, what they ought to do and to preach.* During the troublous times that succeeded, necessity compelled the acceptance of persons into the sacred ministry who were slenderly furnished for their

*Thomassin De Beneficiis, Part I., B. III., c. vi., 4.

office. But the bishops endeavored to improve them by assembling them for conferences, by the diocesan synods, by furnishing them with homilies and exhortations to read to the people, and by requiring their attendance at the cathedral schools.* In the eleventh century these schools are in a flourishing condition, both in the monasteries and in the cathedral cities. The fact that we find theological controversies arising, and heresy charged upon one and another scholar, such as Berengar, Roscelin, and later that erratic and unfortunate genius Abelard, shows a revived interest in theological studies, and the beginning of a feeling for philosophy. Lanfranc, who had been trained to the civil law in Italy, but who became a monk at Bec, in Normandy, and later abbot of Caen, whence he was called by William the Conqueror to be archbishop of Canterbury, made the little monastery of Bec, by his teachings, a renowned seminary ; but he was surpassed in fame by his successor St. Anselm, another Italian, who also succeeded him in the archbishopric. Lanfranc was born about the year 1005, and Anselm in 1033, and their early training shows that there were good schools in Italy at that time. Stimulated by these great scholars the Normans established in England, between the Conquest and the death of King John, five hundred and fifty-three schools.† Anselm of Laon, and William

*Dupin, Century X., p. 68.

†Taine, English Literature, p. 61.

of Champeaux, master of the cathedral school of Paris, each of whom had Abelard for his pupil, were great teachers; it is from William of Champeaux that the impulse started which made Paris an intellectual centre, and gave rise to the university of that city, which received its charter from Philip Augustus in the year 1200.* In the twelfth century several universities were established—that of Bologna, which was a celebrated law-school in the time of Frederick Barbarossa ; that at Oxford, where a professor of civil law is known to have been appointed in 1149; those of Montpellier and Salerno, which were celebrated medical schools. In the thirteenth century others were added to them ; and the learned professions opened out a career to those who were disposed to study. It is of course the custom now to sneer at the learning that was taught in these universities ; but they were invaluable for those times, and they were important factors in the progress of Europe during the Middle Ages. But my point now is, that all this was a movement of the national Churches, and a proof of their activity, irrespective of the Papacy.

2.—Looking in another direction, we find the Church of this period (and here again independently of the Papacy,) endeavoring to make the power of religion felt by all classes of men, and to adapt the divine order to the necessities of the age. I spoke in the last lecture of the effort to limit the right of private warfare by the

* Michelet, I., p. 254.

Truce of God. That was a spontaneous effort of the local Church ; it was taken up by Pope Urban II., when he came into Auvergne to organize the First Crusade, and made universal, so far as the canons of a council could make it universal, at the Council of Clermont ; and if it did not accomplish all that was desired, it marks at least the effort of the Church to put a bridle upon lawlessness.* But it is to be remarked here, that in speaking of the lawlessness and turbulence of the Middle Ages, it is scarcely just to measure them by the legal standard of our own times. In the Middle Ages there was not that access to the courts for the redress of private wrongs, or for breaches of the public peace, with which we are familiar. The law did not take to itself, as it does with us, the monopoly of justice or of vengeance. The lord was bound to protect his vassal from injustice, and to do him justice ; but the vassal was not bound to appeal to his lord, when he could do himself justice, or what he deemed to be justice, upon the offender ; and according to the feeling of the times, he would be thought a coward who should put himself under the protection of the law, when the means of righting the wrong done to him were in his own hands. That was the foundation of the right of private war,

* Peter de Marca, among other documents, gives a letter of Alexander III., approving of what appears to be a kind of mutual insurance against robbery, etc. Each person was to make an annual payment to the common fund, and then if he were robbed, he was to receive the value of his goods provided he could give information that would identify the robber.—*Appendix*, p. 259.

with all the misery it entailed upon the non-combatants. The vassal appealed to his lord to do him justice upon the wrong-doer who was stronger than he, but not necessarily upon his equal, much less his inferior. Now this idea of law and right and justice was ingrained in the feudal system, and the Church could not overcome it until the advance of society brought new ideas of the functions of the law and the judge. It set itself therefore to limit it by the Truce of God. But it did more than this. It endeavored to impress upon the conscience of him who had the right of thus redressing his own injuries, the duty of drawing his sword only in a righteous cause, by surrounding the delivery of his arms to him with the solemnities of religion, and pledging him to knightly honor and purity and graciousness. Hence the institution of chivalry. Its origin seems to be lost in the mists of antiquity. Historians do not seem able to tell us when the Church began to make the conferring of knighthood a religious ceremony. But the custom was certainly older than the crusades; at first local, then spreading by its own fitness, then becoming general. I shall have occasion to point out how the fine gold became dim; but I want you to do justice to the Church by recognizing its endeavor to fulfil its duty of Christianizing all orders of society. M. Guizot describes the reception of a knight in the twelfth century. The candidate was first bathed, then clothed in symbolic garments; he observed a rigorous fast for twenty-four hours; he passed the night in prayer in

church; he made his confession and received the holy communion; he heard a sermon upon the duties of a knight; he was then clothed with his armor and received the *accolade.* The same author gives twenty-six items of the knightly oath taken by the candidate, collected from different forms, showing that he promised to serve God religiously, and his prince faithfully, to maintain the right of the weak, to avoid malicious offence of any one, to obey his commander, to keep faith with all the world, to be courteous and humble, and never to fail in his word, for any ill or loss that might thence happen to him.* "There is," says Guizot, "in this series of oaths, in the obligations imposed upon knights, a moral development very foreign to the lay society of this epoch. Moral notions so elevated, often so delicate, so scrupulous, above all so humane, and always impressed with the religious character, evidently emanated from the clergy. The clergy alone, at that time, thus thought of the duties and relations of men. Its influence was constantly employed in directing the ideas and customs which chivalry had given rise to, towards the accomplishment of these duties, towards the amelioration of these relations."

3.—In still another direction, the Church exerted its influence over the common people—and that also in the development of their traditional institutions entirely apart from the Papacy. I refer to the guilds which were

* Hence the proverb: "Noblesse oblige."

so important a part of the social life of the Middle Ages. Of the various accounts of their origin, that of Sir Francis Palgrave seems the most reasonable, that they were derived from the Roman municipalities and colleges of operatives and artificers. They were of different kinds: the great merchant guilds sometimes became the municipalities of the cities; in other cases, the guilds of the different trades united formed the civic corporation; in other cases they were associations of artisans, or particular classes, or something like modern clubs; again they were friendly societies, organized for mutual assistance; or in many cases they were purely religious associations. But of whatever kind they were, their bond of union was religious. A trades-union of the Middle Ages which had not a home in the parish Church and the blessing of the priest would have been looked upon as a monstrosity. Of the purely religious guilds mention is made in a capitulary of Archbishop Hincmar of Rheims, of the year 859, the object of which was "to unite men for every exercise of religion, for offerings, for mutual assistance, for funeral services, for alms and other deeds of piety." The mediæval Guilds "were essentially *Christian* societies. * * * Whilst embracing the objects aimed at in our modern benefit societies, young men's associations, clothing clubs, burial clubs, trades-unions, aye, and to some extent our banks and trading companies, all the ancient guilds were based upon the foundation of the Christian faith, which, if true and living, must show itself in works of

mercy, corporeal and spiritual. Thus, amid the great multitude of guilds in the Middle Ages, and the variety of special objects for which they were founded, we find precisely the same general principles kept in view. These principles were the united worship of God, and the exercise of love towards man. The real aim of a guild was to make its members more devout towards their Father in heaven, and more full of mercy and charity towards their brethren upon earth."*

Here, then, we see the Church (independently of the Papacy) touching the secular life in the three vocations which dominated the Middle Ages, the pursuit of learning, the pursuit of arms, and the pursuit of trade. Let us get rid of the idea that religion was confined to the cloister, of the idea that the Church was merely the creature of the Papacy; and above all, let us get rid of the idea that mediæval religion was a mass of saint-worship and image-worship,† and of debasing superstitions. How such an idea can have got abroad with the existing monuments of mediæval religion to testify against it, defies all explanation. I want you now to consider what that religion really was. We might fancy, what with Popes and monasteries, and legends of

* Guild Papers, p. 42.

† Bellarmine, having to account for certain *dicta* of Thomas Aquinas and others, contrary to the Second Council of Nicæa, which restored image-worship among the Greeks, is obliged to confess that that Council was not known in the West. Bellarmine, *De Imaginibus Sanctorum.* Lib. II. Cap. XXII. Vol. II. p. 409. Venice, 1721. Charlemagne's work at the Council of Frankfort had been complete.

the saints, and scholasticism, and all that we hear of the corruption and superstition of the times, that the great churches of Christendom, commenced, most of them, late in the twelfth or early in the thirteenth century, and building we might say continuously for centuries, would show in their structure and ornamentation a religion eaten up within of corruption, and encrusted without with superstition; but is that so? On the contrary they are shrines of the purest, as well as most sublime conceptions of Christianity. And what I want you particularly to note is, that it was lay-Christianity—the Christianity of the layman who had been taught and guided by the Church, and who brought, with the bishop and the priest, his knowledge and his skill to make the place of Christ's feet glorious. Gothic architecture, the prevailing architecture of the Middle Ages in England, France, Germany, Spain, and Northern Italy, was in its origin and essence a lay-architecture; the layman's house was Gothic as well as his Church; while the purely clerical or monastic architecture was round-arched, founded on the ancient Roman styles, and developing into what we call Norman.* Here, too, the evidence of continuous Christian teaching from the times we think so very dark is conclusive, and the independence of Rome so marked, that Rome is the one place in the West where Gothic art found no abiding-place.

* See an interesting article on Gothic architecture in Harper's Magazine, for January, 1876.

Long before Gothic architecture became the prevailing style, the people of Venice built their glorious St. Mark's. It was begun, Prof. Norton tells us, somewhere about the year 1050, just at the time that Hildebrand began to be influential, and before Hildebrandine ideas had the opportunity to make themselves felt, and was so far completed in 1071, two years before Hildebrand became Pope, that the incrustation of the interior with its mosaics was proceeded with. I am sorely tempted to print entire Mr. Ruskin's account of these mosaics from "The Stones of Venice," to show the Scriptural character of the religion that conceived them. A few sentences from that matchless description I must give,* and they shall not be the ones usually quoted: "There is one circumstance," says Mr. Ruskin, "to which I must in the outset direct the reader's special attention, as forming a notable distinction between ancient and modern days. Our eyes are now familiar and wearied with writing; and if an inscription is put upon a building, unless it be large and clear, it is ten to one whether we ever trouble ourselves to decipher it. But the old architect was sure of readers. He knew that every one would be glad to decipher all that he wrote; that they would rejoice in possessing the vaulted leaves of his stone manuscript; and that the more he gave them, the more grateful would the people be. We must take

* If I need an apology for so long a quotation, I must plead that it is necessary to my argument. There is but this one description of St. Mark's.

pains, therefore, when we enter St. Mark's, to read all that is inscribed, or we shall not penetrate into the feeling either of the builder or of his times.

"A large atrium or portico is attached to two sides of the Church, a space which was especially reserved for unbaptized persons and new converts. It was thought right that before their baptism these persons should be led to contemplate the great facts of the Old Testament History; the history of the Fall of Man, and of the lives of the Patriarchs, up to the period of the Covenant by Moses: the order of the subjects in this series being very nearly the same as in many northern churches, but significantly closing with the Fall of the Manna in order to mark to the catechumen the insufficiency of the Mosaic covenant for salvation—'Our fathers did eat manna in the wilderness and are dead,' and to turn his thoughts to the true bread of which that manna was the type.

"Then, when after his baptism he was permitted to enter the Church, over its main entrance he saw, on looking back, a mosaic of Christ enthroned, with the Virgin on one side and St. Mark on the other, in attitudes of adoration.* Christ is represented as holding a book open upon His knee, on which is written: 'I am the Door; by Me if any man enter in, he shall be saved.' On the red marble moulding which surrounds the mosaic is written: 'I am the gate of life; let those who

* Note that the Virgin and St. Mark are pictured as worshippers, not as objects of worship.

are Mine enter by Me.' Above, on the red marble fillet which forms the cornice of the west end of the Church is written, with reference to the figure of Christ below: 'Who He was, and from whom He came, and at what price He redeemed thee, and why He made thee and gave thee all things, do thou consider.' * * * The mosaic of the first dome, which is over the head of the spectator as soon as he has entered by the great door (that door being the type of baptism), represents the effusion of the Holy Spirit, as the first consequence and seal of the entrance into the Church of God. * * * On the vaults at the four angles which support the cupola, are pictured four angels, each bearing a tablet upon the end of a rod in his hand: on each of the tablets of the first three angels is inscribed the word 'Holy;' on that of the fourth is written 'Lord;' and the beginning of the hymn being thus put into the mouths of the four angels, the words of it are continued around the border of the dome, uniting praise to God for the gift of the Spirit, with welcome to the redeemed soul received into His Church: 'Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of Sabaoth: Heaven and earth are full of Thy glory. Hosanna in the highest: Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord.' And observe in this writing that the convert is required to regard the outpouring of the Holy Spirit especially as a work of *sanctification.* It is the *holiness* of God manifested in the giving of His Spirit to sanctify those who had become His children, which the our angels celebrate in their ceaseless

praise ; and it is on account of this holiness that the heaven and earth are said to be full of His glory.

"After thus hearing praise rendered to God by the angels for the salvation of the newly-entered soul, it was thought fittest that the worshipper should be led to contemplate, in the most comprehensive forms possible, the past evidence and the future hopes of Christianity, as summed up in three facts, without assurance of which all faith is vain ; namely, that Christ died, that He rose again, and that He ascended into Heaven, there to prepare a place for His elect. On the vault between the first and second cupolas are represented the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ, with the usual series of intermediate scenes. * * * The second cupola itself, which is the central and principal one of the Church, is entirely occupied by the subject of the Ascension. At the highest point of it, Christ is represented as rising into the blue heaven, borne up by four angels, and throned upon a rainbow, the type of reconciliation. Beneath Him the twelve Apostles are seen upon the Mount of Olives with the Madonna, and, in the midst of them, the two men in white apparel who appeared at the moment of the Ascension, above whom, as uttered by them, are inscribed the words, 'Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? This Christ, the Son of God, as He is taken from you, shall so come, the arbiter of the earth, trusted to do judgment and justice.' * * * The third cupola, that over the altar, represents the witness of the Old Testa-

ment to Christ ; showing Him enthroned in its centre, and surrounded by the patriarchs and prophets. * * * If [the worshipper] had time to explore the minor lateral chapels and cupolas, he could find in them the whole series of New Testament History, the events of the life of Christ, and the Apostolic Miracles in their order, and finally the scenery of the Book of Revelation ; but if he only entered, as often the common people do to this hour, snatching a few moments before beginning the labor of the day to offer up an ejaculatory prayer, and advanced but from the main entrance as far as the altar screen, all the splendor of the glittering nave and variegated dome, if they smote upon his heart, as they might often, in strange contrast with his reed cabin among the shallows of the lagoon, smote upon it only that they might proclaim the two great messages —' Christ is risen,' and ' Christ shall come.' * * * And this thought may surely dispose the reader to look with some change of temper upon the gorgeous building and wild blazonry of that shrine of St. Mark's. He now perceives that it was, in the hearts of that old Venetian people, far more than a place of worship. It was at once a type of the Redeemed Church of God, and a scroll for the written word of God. It was to be to them, both an image of the bride, all glorious within, her clothing of wrought gold ; and the actual table of the Law and Testimony, written within and without. And whether honored as the Church or as the Bible, was it not fitting that neither the gold nor the crystal

should be spared in the adornment of it ; that as the symbol of the bride, the building of the wall thereof should be of jasper, and the foundations of it garnished with all manner of precious stones ; and that, as the channel of the Word, that triumphant utterance of the Psalmist should be true of it—'I have rejoiced in the way of Thy testimonies, as much as in all riches.'"

Now it is not only that this is Scriptural teaching—that the mosaics of St. Mark's are founded upon the Bible, but that to conceive and carry out such a design in all its parts, implied not only a desire to honor the Bible and to make it known to people who could not read, but an intimate knowledge of the Bible on the part of those who did this work and a Bible Christianity in the age itself. This is the secret of that wondrous multiplicity of decoration in the cathedrals of the great Gothic period. What was that decoration? It was, strange as it may seem, "the religion of Protestants"—"the Bible and the Bible only." Read Mr. Ruskin's analysis of the west front of Amiens Cathedral in his latest little book, "Our Fathers have told Us," and you must be astonished at the profound knowledge of the Bible manifested in the composition and arrangement of the sculptures. Or study the west front of Wells Cathedral, or many another cathedral which the tourist will remember. I find among my notes the following from Didron's Christian Iconography, concerning the sculptures on the exterior of Chartres Cathedral: "Seventy-five figures represent the Creation, the life in

Paradise, and the fall of Adam and Eve; one hundred and three, the various labors by which, as the result of the fall, mankind eat their bread in the sweat of their brow; one hundred and forty-eight, the virtues he should practise and the vices he should shun; while fourteen hundred and eighty-eight depict the history of the world, through the Old Testament and the New, and the period succeeding the New, the series ending with the solemn scene of the Last Judgment"—a total of eighteen hundred and fourteen sculptures, intended to teach the people, not saint-worship nor image-worship, nor any other "mediæval superstition,"* but the truths of God's revelation and man's duty and responsibility.†

* Mr. Ruskin, "Our Fathers have told Us," p. 136, remarks on the absence of representations of Purgatory in the art of this period: "At what time the doctrine of Purgatory was openly accepted by Catholic doctors I neither know, nor care to know. It was first formalized by Dante, but never accepted for an instant by the sacred artist-teachers of his time—or by those of any great school or time whatsoever."

† "What distinguishes it [the Cathedral of Orvieto] from all others, and makes it worth a long pilgrimage to see, are the pictures in brilliant mosaics, which cover nearly the whole façade. If you want to know what they are, I can only say, 'Go read your Bible *through*.'"—Charles Dudley Warner, *Roundabout Journey*, p. 75.

The difference in biblical knowledge and feeling between the earlier and later painters—those who wrought before the Church had been corrupted by the Papacy, and those who wrought after—is thus shown by Mr. Ruskin in a comparison of the figure of Christ in Orcagna's Last Judgment in the Campo Santo at Pisa, and in Michael Angelo's Last Judgment in the Sistine Chapel at Rome. After saying that Michael Angelo borrowed the gesture of Christ from Orcagna, he shows how he failed of the meaning which the earlier painter put into it. "You all remember the action of Michael Angelo's Christ, the right hand raised as if in violence of rep-

This, then, was the state of the Church, and its credit with the laity before the Hildebrandine theory had completely permeated it. After that it was different. It is a fact written broad and large upon the face of history, that the corruptions of the Church against which men rebelled at the Reformation—those which weighed upon them with crushing force—those which were an offence to their conscience and their reason, and a stumbling block to their faith—those which made the Church itself, formerly so loved and honored, to have become hateful to mankind—were the direct effects of the Papal theory carried out into practice. The mistakes of scholastic theologians in philosophizing upon doctrine, the popular superstitions of the common people, these would have corrected themselves through the natural and educated progress of the human mind, had not the self-regulating action of the Church been fettered by the abnormal and malign influence of the

robation; and the left closed across His breast, as refusing all mercy. The action is one which appeals to persons of very ordinary sensations, and is very naturally adopted by the Renaissance painter, both for its popular effect, and its capabilities for the exhibition of his surgical science. But the old painter-theologian, though indeed he showed the right hand of Christ lifted, and the left hand laid across His breast, had another meaning in the actions. The fingers of the left hand are folded in both the figures; but in Michael Angelo's as if putting aside an appeal; in Orcagna's, the fingers are bent to draw back the drapery from the right side. The right hand is raised by Michael Angelo as in anger; by Orcagna, only to show the wounded palm. And as to the believing disciples, He showed them His hands and His side, so that they were glad —so to the unbelievers at their judgment, He shows the wounds in hands and side. '*They shall look on Him whom they pierced.*'"—Val d'Arno, p. 122.

Papacy, during the course of its dishonorable history from Innocent IV. to Leo X. Not only were nations thrown into disorder by the claim of the supreme political power; but the churches were thrown into still greater disorder by the claim asserted and assented to of supreme spiritual power.

But the Reformation was only the last act of the reaction against these exorbitant claims. The first was the reaction against the political usurpations of the Popes. Less than a century intervened between Innocent III. and Clement V.; but in that time the Papacy descended from the height of political power to the depths of political subserviency. Innocent III. died in 1216; Innocent IV. reigned from 1243 to 1254; Boniface VIII., the last of the Hildebrandines, from 1294 to 1303; in 1305, Clement V. was made Pope by the influence of Philip the Fair of France; he removed the Papacy to Avignon, and the "Babylonish Captivity" began. The Pope was the political slave of the King of France.

I think the real cause of this revolution has not been noted by the historians. It was, in my judgment, the increasing political importance of *The People*, and their loyalty to the Nation, the National Church, and the Sovereign, as against the elements which were ready to disturb the public peace for their own selfish purposes—that is, against the rebellious aristocracy, and the all-grasping Papacy. The appearance of the *Communes*, or Commons, as an influential element in the national life

of Europe at this time, is an important fact in ecclesiastical as well as political history, and merits more attention in this connection than it has received. I have endeavored to show that the Church did its duty to the people in the period with which we have been dealing, and that the people repaid its care with the love and loyalty of which the great cathedrals are the monuments. That love and loyalty were given to the national and local Church, and were not withdrawn from it until the Papal interferences with order and discipline, by exemptions, appeals, extortions, provisions, intrusions, reservations, pluralities, expectatives, and all the iniquities of the *non-obstante* clause had broken down its moral and spiritual power, and made it (as Matthew Paris has it) a slave of the Papacy and a table of money-changers. In the political world the evil consequences of the Papal interference were manifest before they appeared in the Church; and therefore the people strengthened the hands of the kings to resist it. When Philip the Fair was at the height of his quarrel with Pope Boniface VIII., he assembled for the first time the States-General of France, and summoned to it, not only the prelates and the nobles, but also the "Third Estate," the representatives of the Communes, the towns and cities which lived by trade. The fact is significant and tells its own story. The loyalty of these towns and cities was the lever by which the royal power was raised to supremacy over the aristocracy. They found it to their interest to be protected by royal charters; they throve by the pres-

ervation of the king's peace; they required for their prosperity safe roads and security against the plunder of their goods in transit from place to place; they were therefore hostile to robber-barons, and loth to assist in stirring up civil war, and for these reasons they were ready to help the king against rebellion or aggression.* They were therefore in no mood to have the kingdom thrown into disorder for the political benefit of the Papacy, or to be blind tools of Papal animosity or ambition or rapacity.

The history of popular institutions in the Middle Ages is very interesting, and I regret that my knowledge of it is only superficial. The towns and cities began to be of importance at the time of the revival of Europe after the Carlovingian period. But their development was different in the different nations. In Italy a revival of the old municipal life begins to be discernible in the ninth century,† and the cities made rapid progress from that time on. But unfortunately Italian pride was averse to dependence on the German Empire, and the Papacy could not endure an Italian Kingdom; the result therefore of their struggles was the disintegration of Italy, the feuds of Guelph and Ghibelline, the attempt to build up each city into a little republic on the model of ancient Rome, constant wars between the cities themselves, or against the Emperor or the Pope, and finally

*I think a connection can be traced between the "Truce of God" and "the King's peace." See the last Lecture.

†Sismondi, Italian Republics, p. 32.

the subjection of each city to its tyrant noble. In Germany, towns were fortified, as a part of the military policy of Henry the Fowler, and as they increased in trade and wealth the chief of them became free cities of the Empire, and had their place in the German Diet. They were loyal to Henry IV. in his struggle with the Papacy and his rebellious vassals, and a source of strength to Frederick Barbarossa. In France the rise of the Third Estate is said to begin with the patriotic efforts of the clergy to assist Louis VI. (1108–37) against the robber-barons, by arming their vassals, who marched under the lead of their parish priests. In the south of what is now France, there were many of the old municipalities remaining; of the new towns some were voluntarily granted charters by their lords, who, however, appointed their governors and officers ; others obtained by successful struggles, not only franchises, but the privilege of self-government by magistrates of their own choosing. All these found it to their account to draw closer to the king, to fortify their liberties by his charters, and to render him service in return for his protection ; and thus they built up the nation. In England, the increase of trade gave prosperity to the towns, and as they obtained importance they sought to have their liberties secured by royal charters. William the Conqueror's letter to the city of London is short and to the point : "William the king greets William the bishop, and Gosfrith the port-reeve, and all the burghers of London, French and English friendly : and

I do you to wit that I will that ye twain be worthy of all the law that ye were worthy of in King Edward's day. And I will that every child be his father's heir after his father's day ; and I will not endure that any man offer any wrong to you. God keep you."*

By the middle of the twelfth century, the Commons had become so important an element of the body politic, that they began from that time to be called to the great assembly or parliament of the nation. The representatives of the towns were called to the Cortes of Aragon in 1162, to that of Castile in 1169. The Emperor Frederick II., who, as King of Sicily, promulgated a constitution which is said to be an anticipation of modern political enlightenment in the liberality of its provisions, called the deputies of the cities to his General Court in 1232. In 1254 the Commons were first summoned to the English Parliament. The deputies of the cities first made their appearance in the German Imperial Diet in 1255. And in 1302 the "Third Estate" was, as I said, called to the French States-General, to hear the complaints of the King of France against Boniface VIII. Notwithstanding the absolutism of Innocent III., I think we may mark his pontificate (1198–1215) as the epoch when the increased activity, intelligence and wealth of the Commons, as the English call them, of the people, as we call them, began to foreshow a new order of affairs. If you look, in the fourth volume of Guizot's History of

* Stubbs, Constitutional History of England, I., p. 404.

Modern Civilization, at the list of charters granted to the communes by the kings of France from Henry I. to Charles IV., you will notice that those granted by Philip Augustus, the contemporary of Innocent III., are many more in number than those of any king before or after —a very significant fact in this connection. It was Philip Augustus who chartered the University of Paris in the year 1200—the rise of the great universities marking the time when learning was spreading among the laity. In a short time we shall see the lawyers taking their place by the side of the theologians as a learned profession. You remember also that it was at this time that the English people secured their liberties by the Great Charter, and that they held to it, although Innocent III. annulled it by a Papal bull, suspended the Archbishop of Canterbury, and excommunicated the barons. It was a natural result of increased activity in the cities where there were many resident foreigners, and much foreign trade, that lax ideas should prevail, and that there should be some loose and luxurious living. In the County of Toulouse the cities were justly open to this censure; heresy was undoubtedly rife among them; but the Albigensian Crusades, I doubt not, were in part at least urged on by the fears of Innocent III. of the effects of the great popular movement of which he could not be ignorant. A more praiseworthy result of the insight into the signs of the times was the establishment of the two great orders of mendicant friars, that of St. Francis and that of St. Dominic, whose vow of absolute poverty,

even to beggary, compelled them, for the supply of their daily necessities, to be in daily contact with the common people, and whose activity at first in missionary work was as noble as their deterioration was rapid, when they became the army of the Papacy and the instruments of its extortions. All these phenomena occurring just at this time, point out, in my view, the pontificate of Innocent III. as the precise time when the power and influence of the people became an important factor in the political life of Europe. And from the time of Innocent III., the political power of the Papacy began to decline.

For, as I have remarked, the people were at this time naturally on the side of the kings, as against the selfish and rapacious nobility, who did them so much harm in pursuing their right of private war, and in other ways; and they speedily found that it was not to their interest to permit the sovereign to be weakened for the benefit of the Papacy. They therefore instinctively sustained the national cause against the Popes. Even as early as the time of Henry IV. of Germany, the cities adhered to the Emperor, and the common people revered him as a saint after his death. The success of Alexander III., such as it was, against Frederick Barbarossa, was possible only because the Italian cities were determined to shake off the German yoke—because it was impossible for Germany and Italy to form one nation. The long struggle of Frederick II. against Gregory IX. and Innocent IV. is remarkable for the appeals to the peo-

ple on both sides. On the one side the mendicant friars filled the world with denunciations of the Emperor ; on the other side, the Emperor issued manifesto after manifesto against the Pope. And notwithstanding the intense partisanship of Guelph against Ghibelline in Italy, the Emperor held his own. So again, the answer of Philip the Fair of France to the famous bulls of Boniface VIII., *Ausculta fili* and *Unam Sanctam* was to convoke the States-General, and by their aid and counsel to bid defiance to the Pope. When the national feeling of the people had attained strength and consistency, the political supremacy of the Papacy passed away. That is the real meaning of the so-called Babylonish Captivity at Avignon.

Let us now see how the Papal claim of supreme spiritual authority affected the national Churches. Much has been written concerning the usurpation, extortions, and corrupt practices of the Popes in the period immediately preceding the Reformation ; but I have not seen any systematic attempt to estimate their effect upon morals and religion generally. My proposition is, that the alienation of the people from their National Churches at the Reformation was due primarily to that interference of the Papacy with them, resulting inevitably from the Hildebrandine theory of the Papacy itself, which obstructed their normal working, which hindered their adaptation of themselves to the state of Europe in a period of rapid development, and which to

a large extent destroyed their influence in favor of sound morals and true religion.

It happened most unfortunately for the Church, that just at the time the people were obtaining political influence, the clergy, by the progress of the Hildebrandine idea, were more and more withdrawn from sympathy and intercourse with them. Alexander III., we have seen, confined the election of the Bishop of Rome to the College of Cardinals exclusively. That provision became the pattern for the Cathedral Chapters to follow in electing the bishops. The effect was bad both on the Popes and on the bishops. The intrigues of the cardinals among themselves led to the worst results. The chapters made terms with the candidates, and extorted concessions from them which were fatal to discipline, so that the bishop had less power in his own cathedral than in any other church in his diocese. At the same time, as the laity had no approval of the choice made by the chapters, either immediately by that public assent which had obtained in earlier ages, or indirectly by the royal confirmation,* they looked upon their bishop as a stranger, and he became alienated from them. Again, the privilege called "benefit of clergy," which, in accordance with the Hildebrandine scheme, withdrew the minor orders, as well as the priests from the jurisdiction of the secular courts, and secured them virtual immunity for crimes which would

* In England the *conge d'elire* is the mode in which lay influence exerts itself in the election of bishops.

be severely punished in the layman, not only assisted in lowering the morals of the clergy, and provoking the envy or enmity of the laity, but excluded the clergy from the general movement of the people towards a true national feeling. When we remember what a wise ruler and guardian of the kingdom of France, the abbot Suger of St. Denys was, in the absence of Louis VII. on the Crusade, it marks a great change in the relation of the clergy to the kingdom, to find an ordinance of Philip the Fair in 1287 requiring all who possess temporal jurisdiction in the kingdom, as dukes, counts, archbishops, bishops, abbots, and the like, to institute for the exercise of such jurisdiction, bailiffs, provosts, and lay-sergeants, who are not clerics, "to the end that if the said officers should happen to fail, their superiors may proceed against them"*—which they could not do, if they could plead "benefit of clergy." The same ordinance prohibited any but lay-attorneys practising in the courts of France—a very proper provision, according to our ideas, but severely reflecting upon the clergy of that day, as wanting in loyalty; for that was the real reason.

The general complaint against the extortions and evil practices of the Papal legates *a latere* is a commonplace of history, and I need not enlarge upon it.

Much has been written of the political, social and commercial effect of the Crusades upon Western

* Guizot, History Civilization, IV., p. 173.

Europe, less of their religious effect. I have here to note two consequences of the Papal connection with them, the influence of which upon the subsequent moral and religious condition of Europe was most disastrous. The first was the offence given to the conscience of Europe by Papal excommunications for purely political reasons, and the proclamation of a Crusade or "Holy War" against the prince so excommunicated for political reasons. We have naturally some sympathy with the effort to rescue the Holy Land, the scene of the sacred events of our redemption, from the hands of the unbelievers; but to call the purely political and personal war of Gregory IX. and Innocent IV. on the Emperor Frederick II. a crusade, offended the conscience of St. Louis, and it offends the conscience of every reasonable being. There is nothing more iniquitous in all history than the "Holy War" of Charles of Anjou, at the instigation of the Pope, upon the descendants of Frederick. The ruin of Manfred, the murder of the youthful and gallant Conradin, and the oppressions of the French conquerors of Naples and Sicily justify, if any political outbreak ever was justified, the "Sicilian Vespers." Religion could not but suffer, when the dealings of the Popes with the kingdoms of the world were, in intent and will, such as wrought the ruin of the House of Hohenstauffen.

This demand of the Popes upon the allegiance of their adherents, requiring them to consecrate their swords in "Holy Wars," whenever the Papal policy re-

quired the ruin of a prince, introduced into Europe a peculiar and fanatical temper, warlike and inquisitorial, the direct antagonist of the spirit of the Gospel, and which, fostered in its self-delusion by the promise of plenary indulgence, enabled men to commit crime with the full assurance that they were pleasing God and meriting eternal salvation. What manner of man was this Charles of Anjou, who was the instrument of Papal vengeance upon Manfred and Conradin? You get no clear idea of him from Milman, or Gibbon, or Robertson, and therefore you will thank me for calling your attention to this estimate of him by Ruskin, which I believe to be strictly true, and which will help you to enter into the spirit of Guelphism as opposed to Ghibellinism, better than any words I know. First, however, let me give a few preparatory words, also from Ruskin, by way of preface, premising that he is speaking ironically from the Papal stand-point, when he identifies Guelph with Christian, and Ghibelline with infidel. "Of the character of their enemy, Charles of Anjou," he says, "there will remain on your minds, after careful examination of his conduct, only the doubt whether I am justified in speaking of him as Christian against infidel. But you will cease to doubt this, when you have entirely entered into this nascent Christianity of the thirteenth century. You will find that while men who desire to be virtuous receive it as the mother of virtues, men who desire to be criminal receive it as the forgiver of crimes; and that therefore, between Ghibelline or infidel cruelty,

and Guelph or Christian cruelty, there is always this difference, that the infidel cruelty is done in hot blood, and the Christian's in cold. * * * And among the pieces of heraldry most significant in the Middle Ages, the asp on the shield of the Guelphic viscounts is to be much remembered by you as a sign of this merciless cruelty of mistaken religion ; mistaken, but not in the least hypocritical. It has perfect confidence in itself, and can answer with serenity for all its deeds."* Of Charles of Anjou, and the manner of man he was, Mr. Ruskin gives this account from Villani, with the comment that follows, of his own: "This Charles was wise and of sane counsel ; and of prowess in arms, and fierce, and much feared and redoubted by all the kings in the world—magnanimous and of high purposes ; fearless in the carrying forth of every great enterprise ; firm in every adversity ; *a verifier of his every word ;* speaking little, doing much ; and scarcely ever laughed, and then but a little ; *sincere and without flaw as a religious and Catholic person ;* stern in justice and fierce in look ; tall and nervous in person, olive colored and with a large nose, and well he appeared a royal majesty more than other men. Much he watched, and little he slept, and used to say that so much time as one slept, one lost ; generous to his men-at-arms, but *covetous to acquire land, signory and coin, come how it would, to furnish his enterprises and wars ;* in courtiers,

*Val d'Arno, p. 110.

servants of pleasure, or jocular persons, he delighted never." "To this newly-crowned and resolute king, riding south from Rome," says Ruskin, "Manfred, from his vale of Nocera under Mount St. Angelo, sends to offer conditions of peace. Jehu, the son of Nimshi, is not swifter of answer to Ahaziah's messenger, than the fiery Christian king, in his 'What hast thou to do with peace?' Charles answers the messengers with his own lips: 'Tell the Sultan of Nocera, this day I will put him in hell, or he shall put me in paradise.' Do not think it the speech of a hypocrite. Charles was as fully prepared for death that day, as ever Scotch Covenanter fighting for his holy league; and as sure that death would find him, if it found, only to glorify and bless. Balfour of Burley against Claverhouse is not more convinced in heart that he draws the sword of the Lord and of Gideon. But all the knightly pride of Claverhouse himself is knit together in Charles, with fearless faith and religious wrath. 'This Saracen scum, led by a bastard German—traitor to his creed, usurper among his race, dares it look at me, a Christian knight—a prince of the House of France, in the eyes? Tell the Sultan of Nocera, to-day I put him in hell, or he puts me in paradise.' They are not passionate words neither. They are measured, resolute, and the fewest possible. He never wasted words, nor showed his mind, but when he meant it should be known. * * * After fourteen years of misery, Sicily sang her angry vespers, and a Calabrian admiral burnt the fleet of

Charles before his eyes, where Scylla rules her barking Salamis. But the French king died in prayerful peace, receiving the sacrament with these words of perfectly honest faith, as he reviewed his past life: 'Lord God, as I truly believe that you are my Saviour, so I pray you to have mercy on my soul; and as I truly made the conquest of Sicily, more to serve the Holy Church than for my own covetousness, so I pray you to pardon my sins.'" *

Such was Charles of Anjou, and such also in his way was Simon de Montfort, the leader in the Albigensian Crusade. Such was Guelph chivalry and Papal religion. But such was not the chivalry or the religion of Charles' brother, St. Louis, or of the younger Simon de Montfort. Read the eulogy of this nobleman in Matthew Paris: "Thus ended the labors of that noble man Earl Simon, who gave up not only his property, but also his person, to defend the poor from oppression, and for the maintenance of justice and the rights of the kingdom."†

Connected with this Papal perversion of the Christian temper, was the practice of declaring indulgences to the crusaders, leading finally to the sale of indulgences, and, through the unblushing effrontery of Tetzel, to the outbreak of the Reformation in Germany. An in-

* Mr. Ruskin adds: "You are to note the two clauses of this prayer. He prays absolute mercy, on account of his faith in Christ; but remission of purgatory in proportion to the quantity of good works he has done, or meant to do, as against evil."—Val d'Arno, pp. 113-16.

† Matthew Paris, III., p. 355.

dulgence was originally the remission of some part of the canonical penance, or the substitution for it, of some deed of charity or piety as the evidence of sincere repentance ; it could be assigned by any bishop to meet the individual case. During the Crusades the Popes took it upon themselves to proclaim a plenary or general indulgence to all who took the cross. From this beginning it was easy to extend the principle to other methods of serving the Pope ; and finally to the mere gift of money to the Papal treasury ; and it was just as easy for the ignorant or superstitious layman to consider the purchase of an indulgence as assuring the absolute pardon of sin. The bad effect of Tetzel's indulgences upon the members of Luther's own parochial cure, in encouraging them in immorality, was the exciting cause of the great German reformer's indignant protest against them.

The other outcome of the Papal connection with the Crusades which I have in mind, was the pretext they afforded the Court of Rome of extorting money from the Churches throughout Europe. The destructive influence of the Papal financial system upon religion and morality in general was much more direct than might appear at first sight. It was manifest long before the sale of indulgences became the scandal of the Church. Under date of the year 1254, the English chronicler, Matthew Paris, gives this story : "In the same week in which Pope Innocent IV. departed this life, a wonderful vision was seen by a certain cardinal,

whose name is suppressed for caution's sake. It appeared to him that he was in heaven before the Majesty of the Lord, who was sitting at the judgment seat, and on whose right hand stood the blessed Virgin His mother, whilst on His left there appeared a woman of noble person and venerable mien. The latter, with arm extended, carried in her left hand a kind of temple, on the front of which was written in letters of gold, 'THE CHURCH.' Before the Divine Majesty was prostrated Innocent IV., who with clasped and upraised hands and on bended knees, was asking pardon, not judgment. The noble lady, however, spoke against him, saying, 'Oh! just Judge, give judgment aright, for I accuse this man on three points: Firstly, when you founded the Church on earth, you gifted it with the liberties which proceeded from yourself; this man has made it a most abject slave. Secondly, the Church was founded for the salvation of sinners, to gain over the souls of the wretched; but he has made it a money-changer's table. Thirdly, the Church was founded on the firmness of faith; but this man has caused faith and morals to waver, has done away with justice, and overshadowed truth: render me therefore a just judgment.' Then said the Lord, 'Go, and receive your reward according to your deserts;' and thus he was taken away."*

One of the claims involved in the contest of investitures was that of the immunity of Church property

* Matthew Paris, III., p. 101.

from taxation, or what was in those days equivalent to taxation. The sovereigns of Europe succeeded in asserting their right to the customary feudal dues from those estates for which the ecclesiastic did homage; but the Popes claimed that extraordinary imposts to meet a national emergency, could be levied upon Church property only by their permission. The famous "Saladin tithe" was imposed by Richard I. of England, and Philip Augustus of France, upon the clergy as well as the laity of their respective kingdoms, to fit out their Crusade. But in 1199, Innocent III. imposed, for the expenses of the Fourth Crusade, a tax upon the Church throughout Europe of one fortieth of all "movables" (*i. e.*, personal property), to be paid to his own collectors. The example was not lost upon succeeding Popes. Gregory IX. taxed the Church for his crusade against Frederick II. to such good effect that from England alone, when Henry III., the most subservient of all her kings, was reigning, he is said to have received the sum of 950,000 marks, equivalent to about $70,000,000 of our money.* The exactions of Innocent IV. provoked the indignation represented by the story of Matthew Paris which I have just read to you. Urban IV. granted a tenth of the revenues of the Church of France to fit out the expedition of Charles of Anjou against Manfred. These are only examples. Much of the money thus raised was used by the Popes for their

* Hallam, Middle Ages, p. 296.

own purposes, and sometimes it was shared with the kings to secure their license for these exactions.

During the residence of the Popes at Avignon, and the Great Schism that followed, all possible means of obtaining money from the Church were resorted to by the Papacy. The Popes invaded the rights of patronage by which the laity had some influence in the selection of the clergy, and openly sold the succession to bishoprics, canonries, and parishes. In the earlier period, Adrian IV. had requested certain bishops to confer vacant benefices on persons whom he nominated. The request soon became a command, and foreigners who did not pretend to perform their duties drew revenues from the Churches while engaged in the service of the Pope. In one way or another the confirmation of the bishops in their sees was made difficult, and when the election of the chapters was questioned in the Papal court, the Pope would set aside the election, and provide a nominee of his own. From the nomination to the sale of the nomination was an easy step; and "provisions" as they were called, became a source of revenue to the Papacy. Then the expectation of a benefice not yet vacant was sold, and sometimes sold several times over. John XXII., the second of the Avignon line, who has the reputation of being the most avaricious of the Popes, reserved to himself all the bishoprics in Christendom. The same Pope claimed, as the fee for confirming an appointment, the tax called annates or first fruits, the first year's revenue entire of the benefice;

his example became a precedent, so that those who received benefices entered upon them impoverished. In England these exactions led to the famous Statutes of Provisors and Præmunire, by which those who sought preferments from the Papal court were outlawed, and the Church of England was saved from some of the evil effects of these usurpations.

What must necessarily have been the effect upon the national Churches of the exactions of tenths for the Papal wars, of the corrupt bargains with kings to share these taxes, of the open sale of the succession to bishoprics, canonries and benefices to non-residents, of reservations, commendams, provisions, pluralities, expectatives and the rest, in which men with money speculated at the Court of Rome, as men speculate now in railway shares — of exemptions, of appeals decided in favor of the largest purse, of dispensations for the non-observance of solemn oaths? It is easy to see that godly discipline could not be maintained when many of the clergy were non-residents, when foreigners, who were placed in benefices merely for the sake of the income, had no sympathy with the people of their charge, when the Church itself was impoverished by the exactions of the Papacy, and when men of the character to be expected from these doings were entrusted with the cure of souls. Men who had to pay heavily to the Papacy must endeavor to reimburse themselves out of the tenants of their estates, and thus the Churchmen, instead of being as of old, gentle landlords, became

oppressive in their exactions, severe collectors of tithes, and zealous seekers of bequests. They thus obtained, and not unjustly, the reputation of avaricious persons, and the respect and reverence for them fell off. Mr. Hallam remarks, that while the writers of the thirteenth and following centuries complain of the Papacy in terms of unmeasured indignation, the laity came to more universal conclusions, and a spirit of inveterate hatred grew up among them, not only towards the Papal tyranny, but towards the whole system of ecclesiastical independence.* Representations began to be made to the government that the wealth of the clergy, so much of which was sent out of the kingdom, might be better employed in providing for the national defence, and thus the first note of confiscation of Church property was sounded. But discontent at the financial condition of the Church was not the worst. As the reverence for the clergy decreased, the reverence for religion decreased also; immorality spread among the people, and the character of the intruded clergy was not such as to set a good example. It was not as in former times, when the Papacy was corrupt, but the Church was not infected by it; now the evil influence of the Papacy pervaded the whole body; the nominees of corrupt Popes were everywhere, and everywhere they carried the morals of the Papacy into the Churches. There is no gainsaying the fact that there was an immense

* Hallam, Middle Ages, Ch. VII.

moral deterioration in Europe in the latter part of the thirteenth and in the fourteenth century, and that the Papacy was the cause of it. And the worst of the situation was that the people having obtained political influence, and being able to defend the nation from the political encroachments of the Papacy, looked with indifference upon the difficulties of the clergy, resented their exemption from the secular law, felt themselves powerless to redress the grievances of the National Churches so long as the Papal authority was acknowledged by them, and so permitted matters to take their course. The withdrawal of patronage from the laity, the exclusion of the laity from influence in the election of bishops or the nomination of parish priests, the making the clergy a close corporation—abrogating the very principle of the Church's welfare as enunciated by St. Paul: "If one member suffer, all the members suffer with it; if one member rejoice, all the members rejoice with it"—this left the laity hopeless of correcting abuses, and therefore willing to profit by them, and produced a despairing contempt of religion as the guide of human conduct.

The progress of the deterioration was helped forward by the interference of the Mendicant Orders, under the Papal patronage, with the parochial and pastoral rights and responsibilities of the resident priesthood. That the Dominicans and Franciscans originated in a pure impulse of Christian zeal and devotion is not to be denied. But the change which came over them through

their connection with the Papacy was rapid and radical. The establishment of these orders, particularly that of St. Francis, shows the religious earnestness that existed among the common people at the beginning of the thirteenth century, and undoubtedly assisted in advancing it during the first generation after their foundation. You remember the rebuke which St. Dominic administered to the Papal Legates, as they proceeded with pomp and splendor upon their mission of converting the Albigenses: "It is not by the display of power and pomp, cavalcades of retainers and richly-houseled palfreys, or by gorgeous apparel, that the heretics win proselytes; it is by zealous preaching, by apostolic humility, by austerity, by seeming, it is true, but yet seeming holiness. Zeal must be met by zeal, humility by humility, false sanctity by real sanctity, preaching falsehood by preaching truth." Dominic was a Spaniard, a noble and a priest, and therefore his order, though it adopted the principle of mendicancy from the Franciscans, was founded at first, more for preaching the scholastic theology than its rival, and therefore the Dominicans are called the "Friars Preachers." The order speedily obtained command of the Inquisition; its great master, St. Thomas Aquinas, is the chief authority in mediæval divinity; it appeals less to our sympathy than the order of St. Francis, though it is free from the extravagances of the latter. It became not only subservient to the Papacy, but the director of the Papal policy in theology, and was more active than any

other influence in spreading Papalism among the common people. And yet some of the purest theology came from the Dominican convents. The German mysticism found in Eckart and Tauler its best expression.

The lovable, if half-insane visionary, St. Francis of Assisi, was the genuine expression of the religion of the people, exaggerated indeed, but appealing at once to the popular heart. Divesting himself of all property for the sake of Christ, wedded, after the manner of his Master, as he thought, to "Holy Poverty," preaching and practising the love of God, the love of man, and the love of all God's creatures, his example touched the strings of the human heart tuned to that key, in the mediæval society which we are told was so corrupt, and exerted an immediate and universal influence. Now I want you to notice here again, that notwithstanding all that may be said against mediæval superstitions, the Christianity of St. Francis and the foundation-principles of his order were the imitation of Christ. Whatever may be said of the way in which they endeavored to imitate Christ, and whatever may be said of the order at a later period when it was made the instrument of the Papacy for its own purposes—the conception of Christianity which the Church of that age presented to St. Francis and his associates and sympathizers, was that of following Christ and Christ only. The wisdom of their mode of following Christ may be doubted; the power of propagating the initial enthusiasm by the machinery of an order is negatived by its subsequent

history ; but the spontaneous response of the popular heart to the challenge of St. Francis to be Christlike in purity and love is a phenomenon as significant as it is honorable. It is said that out of the religious zeal of St. Francis came the impulse which led to the wonderful revival of religious art in Italy, and how Scriptural that is, let Mr. Ruskin tell us. Here again, the important fact is, that the Franciscans, being of the people, spoke to the people in their own new language, the Italian of the age preceding Dante—a language not yet sufficiently formed to be literary, but so different from the old Latin as to have made that unintelligible. When, in that language, they proclaimed the love of Christ, the people found that they were teaching the truths which the Church was instituted to teach, and there was no need to break with the Church to heed the lesson.

How soon did the fine gold become dim ! The change which so speedily came over the great mendicant orders, and more over the Franciscans than over the other, illustrates by the contrast the purity of the initial impulse. Innocent III., taught by the signs of the times, took the followers of St. Dominic and St. Francis under the protection of the Holy see. His successors, abusing their authority, and taking advantage of the implicit obedience the mendicants rendered them, employed them to spread Papal principles among the people, to execute the Papal commissions, to preach the Papal crusades, to collect the Papal taxes, to sell the Papal

indulgences, and to take the management of the common people into their hands. The evil effects were speedily seen. That great and wise bishop, Robert Grosteste of Lincoln, at first hailed their labors with hearty approval; but before his death he was forced to confess that the friars had more deteriorated in forty years than the monks in four hundred. The sophism that corporate wealth was consistent with individual poverty, the moral dangers of an irresponsible itinerancy, the wild legends of the miracles of their founders, the license and buffoonery of their popular revivalist preaching, the draft on the inventive imagination for material for their addresses, the extravagant claims made for their order, and for the Papacy, and the fact that the more extravagant the claims, the more acceptable they were to the ruling pontiffs — these deteriorated the mendicant orders, and through them deteriorated the religion of the common people; so that whereas at the beginning of the fourteenth century, Europe was still profoundly religious, at the beginning of the fifteenth it was becoming despairingly indifferent or morbidly superstitious, and at the beginning of the sixteenth it determined to take the matter into its own hands.

The ancient Greeks had their doctrine of Nemesis. It was surely a divine nemesis, which brought out of the bosom of the Franciscan order the doctrines that have had most force with Protestants as against the Papacy. The "Everlasting Gospel" of Joachim of Calabria was taken up by the rigid party among the Franciscans, and

after the relaxation of their rule by Gregory IX. in 1230, and still further by Innocent IV. in 1245, they taught that Rome was the Babylon of the Apocalypse, if not that the Pope was the veritable Anti-Christ. In their fierce contest with John XXII., they charged him with heresy; they threw themselves with energy into the conflict between that Pope and the Emperor Louis XII.; William of Ockham argued the Ghibelline cause against the Guelph, defending the Empire against the Papacy. The lawyer Marsilius of Padua found arguments against the Papacy ready made for him by the Franciscans. And in justice to Henry VIII., it must be said that for two hundred years before his time, the doctrine was spread abroad by the rigid Franciscans and others, that the wealth of the Church was its ruin, and the curtailment of it a necessity for its reformation.

I turn to another branch of my subject: While the pastoral work of the Church was thus hindered, and the character and position of the clergy deteriorated through the corrupting influences which emanated from the see of Rome, it was impossible, with the revival of commercial, political and intellectual activity among the people, that there should not appear evidences of ignorant and wild speculation upon religious subjects, as well as survivals of old superstitions, and importations of various opinions and practices from foreign countries. In the eleventh century we find notices of sporadic heresy, here and there, which is called Manicheism, and as such gifted with the char-

acteristics that appear in the earlier patristic accounts of the heretics of that name. One peculiarity, the partaking of a certain food called *consolamentum*, reminds us of the Oriental intoxication with *hasheesh* or opium, and points to a connection with the East, either through the Paulicians of Bulgaria, or through the Fatimite Mohammedans of Spain.* The real horror of heresy

* Toledo was conquered from the Moors by Alfonso VI., King of Castile, in 1085. In his army were a number of French, Provençal and Gascon knights, who were connected with him by his marriage with Constance of Burgundy. The conquest of Toledo "mingled the Moors and the Christians in a more intimate manner. A complete toleration was granted to such of the Moors as remained subject to the King of Castile. * * * This city, one of the most celebrated universities of the Arabians, retained its schools, and all its learned institutions, and spread among the Christians the knowledge of Eastern letters."—*Sismondi, Literature of Europe*, I., p. 98. Of the Paulicians, Sismondi says (p. 154): "The Bulgarians, who had established a considerable commerce between Germany and the Levant, by means of the Danube, spread their opinions over the north of Europe, and prepared the way for the Hussites of Bohemia; while those Paulicians who had become subjects of the Mussulmans, insinuated themselves through Spain into the south of France and Italy." In my copy of Robertson (Vol. II. p. 466. 8vo ed.) I find this MS. note made by myself so long ago that I had forgotten it: "How far is this [*i. e.*, the consolamentum] connected, through the Mohammedans of Spain, with the Shiites of Persia [the Fatimites were Shiites], and a parallel development with that of the Assassins [and the Old Man of the Mountain] a few years later (A.D. 1090.—Michelet I. p. 206) see Pagi in Baronius XV. 232, for the use of drugs by the Paulicians, at Tephrica, anno 871." Here it seems to me is an interesting subject for investigation. I am inclined to think that a mystery is made about the *consolamentum*, because of the theories of mediæval writers who knew more about the tracts of St. Augustine against the Manicheans, than about the natural properties of plants. Michelet, in that wild book of his, La Sorciere, says that Toledo "seems to have been the holy city of Wizards, who in Spain were numberless." He also has the following, speaking of the access to witches for remedies

on the part of a believing people led to some persecution at first, but there were not wanting voices—among them that of St. Bernard—raised against it. As time went on, the indications of these heretics become more numerous along the great lines of commercial activity, and their spread may be compared with that of the Anarchists among ourselves. It was an incident of a time of commercial activity, when also the Crusades produced a great deal of travel and intercourse of people with people; and therefore it is not to be wondered at that strange opinions were rife in Southern France, where commercial intercourse was active, both with the East and with the Mohammedans of Spain, and where, therefore, there would be a cosmopolitan toleration. I do not need to declaim against the iniquity of the Albigensian Crusades, nor to palliate the errors of the Albigenses, who must not be confounded with the Waldenses. But I must, in justice to

against pain: "What we know for surest with regard to their medicinal practice is, that for ends the most different, alike to stimulate and to soothe, they made use of one large family of doubtful and very dangerous plants, called, by reason of the services they rendered, *The Comforters* or Solaneæ," adding in a foot-note: "Man's ingratitude is painful to see. A thousand other plants have come into use; a hundred exotic vegetables have become the fashion. But the good once done by these poor *Comforters* is clean forgotten! * * * The *Asclepias acida*, *Sarcostemma*, or flesh-plant [hasheesh] which for five thousand years was * * * eaten gladly by five hundred millions men—this plant, in the Middle Ages called the Poison-queller (*vince venenum*), meets with not one word of historical comment in our books of botany. Perhaps two thousand years hence, they will forget the wheat."—La Sorciere, p. 121. With all his fancifulness one can learn something from Michelet.

the Church at large, point out how the wholesale persecution of heretics at this period was connected with the condition of the Church, as I have stated it, brought about by the Papal supremacy. That Innocent III. is responsible for the Albigensian Crusades no one will deny. But it is a frequent and sophistical assertion of the Papal advocates, that the burning of heretics was an act of the State and not of the Church. The statement is technically true, but practically false. The establishment of the Inquisition in 1233 made it the tribunal to judge of heresy, and the charge of favoring heresy, easily made against the ruler who refused to inflict the extreme penalty upon condemned heretics, exposed him to the fate of Count Raymond of Toulouse. In the quarrel between Gregory IX. and Frederick II. this charge of favoring heresy was made on both sides. Frederick taunted Gregory IX. with being a fautor of heretics, because they were numerous in Milan, which adhered to Gregory; and to repel the charge the Milanese, as an old chronicler says, "began to burn heretics" in the year 1233.* Gregory retaliated by making the same accusation against Frederick, who felt himself thereupon obliged to make laws against the sectaries. And so, between the Inquisition and the

* Robertson, III., p. 560. In a note on the next page R. says: "Matthew Paris mentions some burnings at Milan in 1240, as caused 'rather by fear of punishment than by love of virtue,' as the Pope was then the only hope of the Milanese." In other words the Milanese had no love for the business.

Papal pressure upon "the secular arm," the disgrace of persecution for religion, whatever share the clergy in general may have taken in it, lies principally at the door of the Papacy.

Here some remarks are pertinent concerning certain strange phenomena of the later Middle Ages. As the popular feeling rose against the Papal usurpations, it seemed more and more necessary to cow it and keep it down. The extension of the definition of heresy to cover every crude opinion of the untheological laity would condemn as a heretic many a sincere and earnest Christian of the present day, and there was the like danger in the Middle Ages. And when the heretic was counted worthy of death, the execution of silly and obstinate people for their crude opinions would naturally provoke the sympathy of all who were indignant at the condition of the Church, and increase the number of those who would think their errors indifferent, their fanaticism heroic, and their fate unjust. The persecution of heretics, therefore, did not reduce the number of their sympathizers ; and so it seemed good to the powers that then were, to terrorize the popular mind by raking up from the records of the past all the horrors attributed to the Gnostics and Manicheans of the first ages of Christianity, and imputing them to the sectaries of the thirteenth century. Undoubtedly the type of opinion represented by the term Albigenses was Manichean in principle ; and this being so, the theologian would feel justified in describing the Mani-

chean heretic of his own day by what he learned from his books of the Manicheans of the fourth century. But what I want to point out now is, that after the Albigensian crusades these stories seem to have lost their terror, and it was necessary to improve upon them. Hence we find that when Gregory IX. in 1232 commissioned Conrad of Marburg to proceed as inquisitor against the Stedingers, stories of dealing with the devil and the witches' sabbath begin to make their appearance. These stories, with the necessary variations, are made good use of by Philip the Fair in proceeding against the Knights Templars, when he determines to suppress that order. Finally, under John XXII., the second of the Avignon Popes, there are tales of a sudden outburst of witchcraft and malignant magic and diabolical incantations taking the place of the old accusations of heretical pravity — notions which held their own until they had succeeded in putting an ineffaceable stain upon Puritan New England. The fact to notice, however, is that at the time we are speaking of, these extreme and fanatical beliefs in heretical depravity and diabolical dealings appear where the Papacy is most active and the Inquisition most powerful.

But we must not suppose that even under these conditions, all religious zeal among the laity was drawn off from the Church into the heretical sects. If, as I have endeavored to show, the Church in earlier ages was faithful to its mission, it was not possible that the

Christian tradition should not hold its own, and the desire for a Christian life should not survive among the people, even though their institutions were thus thrown into disorder. The traditions of the home and the fireside have as much to do with religion as the public teaching of the Church. Prof. Stokes, in his very interesting volume just published on Ireland and the Celtic Church, remarks upon the firm hold which tradition has upon the uneducated mind—and we take it for granted that people who in the Middle Ages could not read Latin were uneducated; at least they had not newspapers to draw them off from home and local instruction. "The more you investigate," he says, "the more you will be struck with the firm, tenacious grasp tradition, traditional scenes, traditional history, traditional games and celebrations take of the popular mind. * * * Nothing destroys tradition so utterly and so rapidly as education. Give a peasant a penny newspaper and teach him to use it, get him to take an interest in the politics of Europe, and the great political questions which may be exciting his own country, and you deprive him of the keen interest he once took in the stories handed down from generation to generation, and told round the fireside on the winter evenings, as the rain and the storm raged without."* Among ourselves, the common people in the village and the country are conservative by the operation of this principle; the innovation and

* Ireland and the Celtic Church, p. 57.

the corruption spread in the lines of commerce and of political activity, and, in an aristocratic state of society among the governing classes, before they affect "the people." In the Middle Ages it was much more so, and among persons of higher intellectual status than nowadays, when the newspaper circulates everywhere. I do not assert that the Middle Ages were better than, or as good as our own for this reason ; but I do say that this must be taken into the account in estimating the progress of the corruption which is so freely charged upon the whole Church in the period preceding the Reformation. Dr. Neale, the eminent Liturgical scholar, argues that the Liturgies of outlying and secluded districts are more primitive in their structure than those of the great Patriarchates because of the conservatism of such districts. The principle must be applied, in all justice, to the problem of the condition of Christian belief among the laity at this period—which is the true test of the faithfulness of the Church. Again, allowance must be made for the fact that language was in a transition state, and that it was not easy for persons trained as theologians to think and dispute in Latin to preach in the vernacular ; and therefore that public preaching became less frequent—as many persons wish it was at the present day. At the same time, the fact that the people could not read Latin kept, to some extent at least, hurtful innovations from them. They could understand sculptures or paintings, like those on St. Mark's, Venice, or Chartres Cathedral, when they could

not, and did not want to, understand the last subtilty of the scholastic philosophy, or the last argument for the plenary authority of the Pope. And therefore it is not to be doubted that at this time there were multitudes of sincere and earnest souls, seekers after God, and believers in our Lord Jesus Christ, who were faithful to the Church, and found in it the nurture of their spiritual life; and it is pathetic to see how the earnestness and faith of some of them were repressed, when they sought for the approval of those high in authority, or how their influence for good, when they became active workers, was perverted, either by the unjust ban of the Papacy, or its interested and selfish favor. The Waldenses are an example of the one, the Franciscans and Dominicans of the other. The Waldenses are sometimes asserted to be "survivals" of a time when the Church was Presbyterian—a condition which can be found nowhere in all history before John Calvin.* As a matter of fact the Waldenses had no desire to break with the Church; what they did desire was to have the Scriptures in the new language which had been gradually forming itself among the people, in which there was as yet no literature. In their simplicity they laid their books and teachings before Pope Alexander III., and had he dealt

* Hooker's Challenge to the Puritans has never been met: "We require you to find out but one Church upon the face of the whole earth, that hath been ordered by your discipline, or hath not been ordered by ours, that is to say by Episcopal regiment, sithence the time that the blessed Apostles were here conversant."—*Preface to Eccl. Polity, Ch. IV., p.* 1.

with them as Innocent III. did later with the Franciscans, they would not have formed a sect of their own. But his cardinals laughed at them for their want of scholastic learning; and in an evil hour Lucius III. (A.D. 1184) excommunicated "those who falsely styled themselves *humiliati* or poor men of Lyons."* They then went to the other extreme in opposing, not only the existing system, but the truth of the visible Church; and they suffered severely at the hands of the Inquisition.

It is the fact that all through mediæval Europe, while the evil influence of the Papacy was making itself felt in the high places of Church and State, and slowly filtering down, the tradition of the home and the fireside was doing its work for Christian faith and feeling; and it was helped by the traditional system of the Liturgy and the Christian year. Is it not significant that English Literature begins with Piers Plowman's Vision; and that the "Imitation of Christ" appeared at the very worst period in the history of the Church? Michelet says that there are *two thousand editions* of this book in Latin, *a thousand in French*, sixty French translations, thirty translations into Italian, besides others of which he makes no mention. Surely this fact of itself proves that in the age preceding the Reformation, religion was not to be found only among the sectaries; it is not true that the Church was utterly corrupt.†

* Robertson, III., p. 201.

† There is another branch of this argument which I have not time or space to develop. It is that as the sectaries departed from the traditional

What, then, was the evil of these times? It was that the Hildebrandine system, as administered in the thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth centuries set fidelity to the Papacy above true Christian morality. So far as this affected the Church, so far it corrupted it; when the Church was able to resist it, religion held its own. And therefore, for more than a century before Luther, the cry was constantly being repeated for a Reformation. The reforming Councils of Pisa, Constance and Basle made honest efforts to reform the Church; but they failed because they could not bind the Pope, and they were not prepared to renounce allegiance to him. Nor were they willing to call the people to their aid. They were fearful of revolution instead of reformation.

I must, I find, compress what more I have to say into the fewest possible sentences. A few dates in the subsequent history of the Papacy are all that are necessary for this lecture; the details you can read in Robertson. On St. Martin's Day, Nov. 11, 1305, Clement V. was crowned at Lyons; he remained in France for five years, and then fixed his residence at Avignon. For seventy years the Papacy was virtually subject to France. During this period the House of Valois came to the throne; the feudal nobles, who had been curtailed of their privileges in the previous reigns, reasserted themselves; and France was made to suffer in the wars with Edward

Christianity of the Church—I mean from that which had descended from ancient times in the National Churches—they became wild and fanatical and corrupt: *e. g.*, the Brethren of the Free Spirit and the Anabaptists.

III. of England. January 15, 1377, Gregory XI. restored the Papacy to Rome, where Rienzi had lately "strutted his brief hour upon the stage." But the Great Schism of 40 years immediately followed (A.D. 1377–1417), in which there was a line of Rome, a line of Avignon, and part of the time a line of the Council of Pisa.

In 1375, two years before Gregory XI. returned to Rome, the Republic of Florence, exasperated at the bad faith of the Papal legate who governed in Italy, sent its army into the Papal States, under a banner inscribed with the one word, "Libertas," and in ten days, eighty cities were restored their republican constitutions. In the same year in which Gregory returned, he sent a bull to England, requiring the authorities to investigate the errors attributed to John Wycliff. Put these two apparently unconnected facts together, and study their meaning. They mean among other things this, that in Italy and in England alike, the people have discovered the true character of the Papacy. For the offence of Wycliff was not that he held such and such opinions—others had held and taught with impunity much the same as he did—but these others had taught them in the schools and in Latin, while John Wycliff was teaching them in English and to the people. But they mean more than this. They mean that Europe was now conscious that it was passing through a revolution which should bring the Middle Ages to an end, and introduce what we call modern times. And by the operations of the Papacy the Church had been enfeebled,

so that it was not able to guide the Ship of State through that revolution. Take a single illustration. In the feudal times, the life of a noble was one of laborious industry. He was not only an officer of the army, but the governor of a district, and a judge of the people. While the right of private war existed, he was bound to be on the alert to avenge his injuries, or to defend his possessions and his people. When there was public or national war, he was bound to furnish his contingent to the army, and to lead it himself. As the nation gained consistency, and the cities became more important, the changes in the political condition deprived the nobility one by one of these duties and responsibilities. As soon as it was found that infantry could meet cavalry, and when gunpowder rendered armor useless, the mercenary soldier, and later the standing army deprived the noble of his military consequence. The extension of the royal law over the kingdom, and the practice of the lawyers in the king's courts put an end to the baronial administration of justice; and the government of cities and towns by the king's officers, or by their own magistrates, restricted his functions as governor and lord of his district. The noble, under these changed conditions, found his life useless, and time hung heavy on his hands. He became an absentee landlord, spending his time amid the revels of the court, and compelled to oppress his vassals and his tenants for the means to support his extravagance. "When the pride of wealth and pomp," says Prof. Stubbs, "took the place of political aspira-

tions, personal indulgence, domestic tyranny, obsequious servility followed as unmitigated and deeply-rooted evils." Then, when a general calamity, like the Black Death, swept over the country, the evils of a transition period became exaggerated, and the luxury and privileges of the nobility produced, as they had a right to do, discontent among the suffering and the destitute, that is to say the serf and the laborer. The privileges and luxury had been the pay of work done; now the work was not done; but the privileges were clung to tenaciously, and the luxury increased and became vicious. I cannot go more into this, but this one illustration may show how the old order was passing away, and the new was not yet formulated. Now when, under these conditions, the evils in the Church, made worse by the Avignon Papacy and the Great Schism, came into debate, it was felt that the state of Europe, both political and ecclesiastical, was so bad that any attempt at readjustment would bring down the whole fabric of government, kingly as well as papal. That was the meaning of the attempt to silence Wycliff. England, fortunately, was in a better condition than other countries. Her constitution was developing in an orderly manner, and there was no real break between the old order and the new. And therefore, with all the efforts of the Papacy, and the Papal portion of the Church of England, Wycliff's University of Oxford and the people stood by him, and he died quietly in his bed. On the continent it was different. And therefore when

the University of Paris took in hand the reform of the Church, it was afraid of the popular movement, and John Huss was burned at the Council of Constance, to the eternal infamy of wise and good men like Gerson, ostensibly for heresy, but really because he had made the appeal to the people, which the authorities feared because they were, as I said, afraid of revolution. Huss was burned for political reasons, quite as much as for imputed heresy; and terribly was he avenged in the Hussite wars. To the honor of England let it be said that if Robert Hallam, Bishop of Salisbury, had lived to the end of the Council of Constance, Huss would not have suffered.

I shall not have time during the present academic year to prepare another lecture for this course, although the terms of the foundation permit seven; and therefore I must leave the subject in this incomplete state. The Reforming Councils of Pisa, Constance and Basle, show the sincere desire of the national Churches to bring back the Church Catholic to a healthy condition. At Constance, particularly, the fact I have insisted upon that the National Churches must be taken into the account in estimating the good and evil of the times is shown by the method of voting—by nations. That these councils accomplished nothing very great was because they could not bind the Popes. The Hildebrandine theory made the Pope superior to a council, and the inferior could not bind the superior. After the Council of Basle, the Pragmatic Sanction of Charles

VII. did something for the Gallican Liberties; but the old evils remained, wherever the Papal influence could be exerted. The Popes themselves descended to the level of Italian intriguers, of whom Alexander VI. was the worst. In the meantime, Constantinople was taken by the Turks, and fugitives from that city brought the Greek learning into the West. The printing-press was invented, and books became accessible to the multitude, and libraries numerous for scholars. The discovery of America changed the commercial condition of the world, and compelled the new adjustments which brought the Middle Ages to an end. Just at this time, Leo X. sent his preachers of indulgences into Germany, which had been groaning under her "hundred grievances," and the righteous indignation of Martin Luther broke out against them, and we know the rest. Into that it has not been my intention to enter. I hope I have shown that there was a living Church, doing its work for Christ, even in the unreformed ages.

One word in conclusion. If my interpretation of the history I have endeavored to review is correct, and I believe it is, we need no vindication of our position, as members of the historic Church, both Catholic and Reformed, other than the intelligent knowledge of its history. The English Reformation avoided the evils of the Continental uprooting. In breaking finally with the Papacy, while holding to the unchangeable order of the Ministry of Apostolic Succession, it removed the great cause of the evils which had afflicted the Church,

and gave opportunity for that recurrence to and development of true Church principles, which, please God, is to be more complete as time goes on. At the same time, in the English Reformation there are the seeds of other difficulties. The relation of Church and State is too much of a piece with that under Constantine. Here, in the United States, we are, by Divine Providence free from State politics as well as Papal tyranny. In this respect, notwithstanding our difficulties, our reformation is one step in advance of the English, and our position with reference to the future is so much better. Hitherto we have been a feeble and timid folk, afraid to assert our privileges and prerogative as the Church in the United States of America. But, day by day, as the fact of our reformation works in us, and we obtain clearer views of our vocation, and the power of divine grace granted us in the Apostolic Ministry, and the Sacraments of the Gospel—as we feel our freedom in Christ—as we feel that we are the Church and not a sect—the Catholic faith and spirit revive in us, and we go forth, following Him, who has on His vesture, and His thigh, a Name written, KING OF KINGS AND LORD OF LORDS, conquering and to conquer.

THE END.

LIBRARY
NEW YORK

239.05
1887

Egar. John St., D.D.

239.05
1887